DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 616 SP 028 001

TITLE	COTEP:A Cooperative Effort to Improve Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION	Coalition of Teacher Education Programs.
PUB DATE	Sep 86
NOTE	116p.; For related papers commissioned by COTEP, see SP 027 919-925.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; Admission Criteria; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Improvement; Student Recruitment; Student Teacher Supervisors; Teacher Certification; Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Coalition of Teacher Education Programs; *Indiana

ABSTRACT

The Coalition of Teacher Education Programs (COTEP) is a voluntary group of six Indiana universities: Ball State, Indiana State, Indiana University, Purdue, and the University of Evansville. This report from COTEP summarizes the recommendations made in nine commissioned papers on improving the education of teachers. These papers focused on topics of direct interest to schools of education, such as the recruitment of minority students, the use of case studies in teacher education, the liberal arts curriculum, and the placement of teacher education in general. The first section of the report deals with the recruitment, admission and retention phases of teacher education. The second section covers major concerns in the development of an effective curriculum for teacher education students. The focus of this section is on the three basic components of teacher education: general education, majors/minors, and professional education. In the third section, the establishment of effective field experience programs is discussed. The fourth section examines the role and responsibilities of university supervisors of student teaching. Induction of new teachers and teacher certification are the topics covered in the final section. Specific recommendations for the improvement of teacher education programs in each topic area are given, the rationale for each recommendation is presented, and suggestions are provided for implementing the recommendations. Appendixes include a list of the commissioned papers and a summary of the recommendations. A 15-page bibliography is also included. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED273616

COTEP:
A COOPERATIVE EFFORT TO IMPROVE TEACHER EDUCATION

SP 028 001

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Marker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Coalition of Teacher Education Programs is a voluntary organization of six universities:
Ball State University, Butler University,
Indiana State University, Indiana University,
Purdue University, and the University of Evansville

September 1986

COTEP: A COOPERATIVE EFFORT TO IMPROVE TEACHER EDUCATION

The Policy Board

Coalition of Teacher Education Programs
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
September 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i

INTRODUCTION 1

What is COTEP? 1

The Issue of Structural Reform 3

Project Operation 4

Recommendation Format 5

THE SHAPE OF THE PROFESSION 7

Wanted: A Few (More) Good People 7

Forgivable Loans 12

Attracting More Minority Students 13

Enabling Informed Choices 14

Admission: The Next Step 15

NCATE Standards 17

Basic Skills Test 18

Establishing Classes 20

CURRICULUM 23

Basic Components of the Curriculum 24

The Liberal Arts 26

The Education Curriculum 31

The Science of Teaching 34

Theory and the Real World 36

Case Studies: A Way of Testing Theory 40

New Social Realities 43

Furthering Program Integration..... 45

Programs for Non-traditional Students 47

Developing Program Themes..... 49

Better Use of Program Feedback 50

FIELD EXPERIENCES 52

Building Cooperative Arrangements..... 52

Improving Supervision 53

Compensation 54

Selecting Field Experience Supervisors 56

STUDENT TEACHING 58

University Supervisors of Student Teaching 60

INDUCTION AND CERTIFICATION..... 63

Induction Year Support..... 63

Certification Testing..... 65

Probationary Year 66

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT 70

CONCLUSION..... 72

BIBLIOGRAPHY 75

APPENDIX I Summary of the Discussion Regarding the Proposal to Place Teacher Education at the Graduate Level 90

APPENDIX II Board, Panel, Writing Team and Staff... 98

APPENDIX III Commissioned Papers 103

APPENDIX IV Summary of Recommendations 105

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While this report is issued under the name of the COTEP Policy Board, this report, like most commissioned studies and reports, is the product of the energy, talent, skill and experience of many people. We acknowledge by name only a few here; others are identified by name in the appendix, according to role performed.

The faculty of the six universities deserve mention. Representatives of the faculty served on "writing teams." They were the primary source of ideas for the recommendations that appear throughout the document. In their work they drew liberally upon the experience of colleagues at each institution. Ultimately, it will be the faculty's responsibility to implement these recommendations, to turn reform rhetoric into reformed practice.

We owe a special debt to Gerald Marker, Professor of Education at Indiana University. He served as Executive Secretary of COTEP and directed the study. He managed all aspects of the project: grant administration, organization of writing teams, commission of special studies, preparation of draft reports, etc. While his experience as a teacher educator qualified him to serve as Executive Secretary, his personal qualities -- intelligence, tact, patience, and tolerance for ambiguity -- were no less important.

Professor Marker was assisted ably by Judy Meloy and Aloma Billings. At the time the study was launched, Dr. Meloy was a graduate student pursuing a doctoral degree in higher education

graduate student pursuing a doctoral degree in higher education administration and educational inquiry. She served as a graduate assistant to the project, contributing especially to the literature search and to manuscript editing. Mrs. Billings was project secretary and assumed responsibility expertly for all clerical and secretarial tasks. In a word, the project was blessed with an extaordinary staff.

We also wish to acknowledge the support provided by the Lilly Endowment, Inc. While each of the participating universities drew upon its own resources to support the study, their resources were enhanced significantly by funds provided by the Lilly Endowment, Inc. We are especially grateful to H. Dean Evans, then Senior Program Officer for Education at the Endowment and more recently Indiana State Superintendent for Public Instruction, and to William Bonifield, Vice President for Education at the Endowment, for their enouragement and support.

COTEP Policy Board

INTRODUCTION

What is COTEP?

The Coalition of Teacher Education Programs (COTEP) is a voluntary group of six universities: Ball State University, Butler University, Indiana State University, Indiana University, Purdue University and the University of Evansville. Drawn together by a concern over the coming shortage of qualified teachers and by a concern for the tarnished image of the teaching profession, the members pledged to take collective action to improve their teacher education programs. Since the six universities prepare over 80 percent of Indiana's supply of new teachers, the deans believed that a joint effort could make a substantial difference in the quality of the Indiana teaching force.

Desiring to assume a proactive rather than a reactive role with regard to teacher education in Indiana, the deans formed COTEP. A coalition arrangement was viewed as the best framework in which to study teacher education and make recommendations for its improvement. Early discussions among the deans made it apparent that the following assumptions were shared.

--Reforms undertaken voluntarily are more likely to succeed than those mandated by others.

--Changes proposed by those who will later implement them have the best chance for success.

--Difficult decisions are easier to make if the group making them is kept small and its members share common needs and hopes.

--Curriculum change is a locally oriented enterprise.

--Teacher education remains essentially a state level enterprise.

--Higher education should focus its reform efforts upon improving teacher education rather than upon reforming the teaching profession.

In addition to the assumptions just stated, certain national trends and developments provided a framework within which the project took place. The following mix of events shaped the broader context in which COTEP operated.

--Teacher education has become a highly visible political issue, as evidenced by numerous national commissions and task forces.

--States are moving aggressively to take greater control of education at all levels. For example, states are strengthening high school graduation requirements, establishing criteria for admission to teacher education programs and requiring pre-licensing tests.

--Teacher education on many campuses is underfunded.

--Teacher organizations such as the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers are not in agreement on issues such as national teacher certification, merit pay and career ladders.

--Teacher education associations and accrediting organizations such as the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education support the reform of teacher education but do not totally agree on what reforms should be undertaken.

These events and trends, together with the articulated assumptions of the deans, influenced the planning of COTEP and the context within which the project operated.

The Issue of Structural Reform

At the time when COTEP was in the planning stage the issue of where in the college curriculum teacher training should be located had not moved front and center in the national debate regarding teacher education. During the fourteen month period when COTEP was in operation, two national reports advocated that undergraduate teacher education be abandoned and that the entire enterprise be moved to the graduate level. COTEP gave careful consideration to the proposal to make teacher education a graduate endeavor. After considering all aspects of the proposal, it was decided that more was to be gained at the COTEP institutions by making improvements in teacher education at the undergraduate

level than by shifting the placement of the training programs to the graduate level. The discussion about where to locate teacher education strengthened the belief of COTEP members in the essential soundness of their undergraduate programs. Readers interested in the reasoning behind this decision are referred to Appendix I.

Project Operation

During the summer and fall of 1984, a proposal was prepared and submitted to the Lilly Endowment, Inc. Through a series of discussions with foundation officials, the proposal was modified and then funded during the spring of 1985. In addition to foundation support, each member institution agreed to contribute to the support of the project in both direct and indirect ways.

The deans decided early in their discussions that any change effort would need to involve others from their institutions who were not identified as teacher educators. Because as much as 75 to 80 percent of the training of a teacher occurs outside the professional school or department, it was clear that if meaningful change were to take place those with campus level authority and influence would need to be involved. It was this understanding which explains the composition of the project's Policy Board. (see Appendix II)

The project Policy Board commissioned nine papers on topics of direct interest, such as the recruitment of minority students, the use of case studies in teacher education, the liberal arts curriculum, and the placement of teacher education in general.

(see Appendix III for a complete list of the papers) As these papers were produced they were shared with members of the Policy Board, Advisory Panel and the Writing Team.

It was also obvious that while the project would focus upon things which could be done to improve teacher education at the six member universities, many others had a stake in such changes. This led to the formation of an Advisory Panel composed of representatives from organizations with a special interest in the work of COTEP. (see Appendix II)

Finally, during the fall of 1985, a Writing Team composed of faculty members from the six institutions was formed and began operation. (see Appendix II) After a series of meetings during the fall, winter, and spring, the team forwarded 40 draft recommendations to the Policy Board for its consideration. These recommendations served as the basis of the final report.

Recommendation Format

The Writing Team examined the recommendation formats used by other task forces and commissions and selected one which lists each recommendation with its own rationale and implementation statement. While such a format leads to some overlap between the report's general narrative and that contained within a particular recommendation, it does afford the reader the opportunity to turn directly to specific recommendations to see the rationale and implementation statement. The recommendations, excluding rationale and implementation statements, are listed in Appendix IV for quick reference.

The implementation statement included in each recommendation is intended to be illustrative. As work begins on each recommendation, other more effective means for implementing it may be found.

THE SHAPE OF THE PROFESSION

Every career group reflects its recruitment and selection process and teacher education is no exception. Many other factors such as social status, working conditions and pay also shape professions but the foundation is laid with the recruitment and selection process. Thus the first recommendations in this report deal with the recruitment, admission and retention phases of teacher education.

Wanted: A Few (More) Good People

Virtually every one of the recent commission or task force reports on teacher education has called for a major effort to recruit greater numbers of good people into teaching. The intent of the recruitment effort is to address the continuing concern for quality education. Since it remains the general impression that there is presently a surplus of teachers in many subjects or grades, one is prompted to question the necessity of the effort. However, there is a set of contradictory forces quietly at work which mandate attention to this aspect of teacher education.

The context of this concern is the cyclical supply-demand-oversupply-shortage of teachers in the work force. The most recent phase of the cycle occurred during the 1960's, when a rapidly expanding school population created a severe teacher shortage despite the fact that 24 percent of those who entered college chose teaching as a career (Lanier, 1984). Teacher education enrollments soared. By the 1970's, however, the supply

finally caught up with the demand. Graduates of teacher education programs found it increasingly difficult to obtain jobs. Students who had been selecting teaching as a career began instead to choose fields such as business, law, and computer science.

An oversupply of teachers and increased opportunities for individuals who traditionally chose teaching as a career have contributed to the next phase of the cycle--an immediate shortage of math and science teachers in 42 states and the District of Columbia (Feistritzer, 1983). By the year 1990, there is an anticipated demand for 220,000 teachers annually from a total applicant pool only 2/3 that size (Howey, K.R., Matthes, W., & Zimpher, N., 1985). The size of the pool is explained in part by the fact that in 1982, only 5 percent of college freshmen indicated that they wanted to become teachers (Feistritzer, 1985b).

The need to recruit, train and supply 220,000 new teachers a year requires a massive effort. "No other occupation can claim a membership of over two million college graduates and tens of thousands with advanced degrees" (Lanier, 1984, p. 34). The magnitude of the recruitment and replacement task is made even greater by the fact that only 70 percent of those who complete teacher education programs go on to practice their profession. Schlechty, George and Whitford (1978) observed that "...in no established profession is it assumed that initial training is an 'exploratory' phase. Commitment is assumed. In most professions selection is a pre-training consideration. In teaching selection is a post-training phenomenon...." (p. 316). In a survey reported in the May/June issue of CHANGE: THE MAGAZINE OF HIGHER LEARNING,

students were asked about both their career choice and their primary field of interest. Of those planning a business career, 49 percent agreed it was also their primary field of interest. Twenty-nine percent of the students headed into allied health fields said that they were their primary fields of interest. Among elementary teacher prospects, 35 percent indicated that education was also their primary field of interest. Among prospective secondary majors, however, the figure dropped to 10 percent ("Education Majors Borrow ....," 1986).

Raising entry standards and licensing requirements will make the profession less accessible and may increase the level of commitment exhibited by students entering the field. One can certainly speculate that the observed low level of commitment on the part of teacher education students is partly a function of the ease of entry and licensure into the profession.

Recruitment and admission are only half of the story. Fewer persons who are presently teaching will remain in the work force. The National Center for Educational Statistics estimates that by 1993, "3 out of 5 of the 2.7 million teachers will be people not now teaching" (Feistritzer, 1985a). Many teachers will retire or make mid-life career changes. Turnover therefore increases the number of persons who must be added to the pool. Of those who actually accept teaching positions, only 50 percent remain after 7 years, and those who stay in teaching are disproportionately the less academically able (Schlechty & Vance, 1982). Job satisfaction among teachers has steadily declined. A poll of several thousand teachers in 1981 indicated that nearly 40 percent of the respondents would not select teaching as a career were they

to start over, a figure up from 10 percent in 1971 (Darling-Hammond, 1984).

The situation is complicated by the desire on the part of both the policy makers and the public to see better students select teaching as a profession. Various writers have lamented the fact that the average SAT scores of those going into teaching over the past decade have declined faster than the scores of the total pool of entering college freshmen (Darling-Hammond, 1984). But, as Lanier (1984) pointed out, "teacher education does not fail to attract and retain persons with high ability. If there is a failure, it is that teaching does not get as many as might be hoped for... (p. 43). What education needs is a recruitment and retention policy which results in the overall norm for those entering the teaching force coming from the average and above rather than the average and below.

Given the size of the work force, it is unrealistic to believe that every classroom can be staffed by a bright, energetic student. If every senior from the upper fifth of his or her graduating class went into education, there still would not be enough teachers to fill the projected need. Thus, teaching has relied and will continue to rely on a large number of average students. This is even more true now that other occupational groups such as the armed forces have decided that they too must draw a larger proportion of their recruits from the "top 10 percent."

Why is it then that as retirements and opt-outs fuel the growing demand for new teachers the number of those wishing to

enter the profession declines? There is no single answer. Salary, working conditions, the social status of teachers and perceptions of the job market all influence career choices. Schlechty & Vance (1982) have argued that the school features which discourage academically able students from selecting teaching are: (1) a front-loaded reward system and the lack of a clear career ladder and career stages, (2) a tendency of schools to discourage shared decision making and problem-centered analytical discussions among adults, and (3) the conflict between an informal school culture geared to nurturance and growth and the dominance of a management structure that is punishment centered and bureaucratic.

The prospect of having to pass examinations at both the entry and exit points of teacher training programs may also be discouraging some students. Such tests appear to have had a special impact on minority students who are disproportionately screened out by the process. It is difficult to know how many students choose not to apply to teacher education programs rather than risk the possibility of failing either the entry test or the certification examination. When this is combined with the fact that since 1980-81 the number of blacks entering college in Indiana has declined by 15 percent, the extent of the problem becomes apparent.

Finally, one must take into account the impact of the women's and civil rights movements. Women and minorities now have a broad range of career options from which to choose. In fact, they are often sought after as other professions seek to meet affirmative action goals. These increased options have resulted in the

current situation where only 6 percent of those entering teaching are black and only 1.7 percent are hispanic (Howey et al., 1985).

When one combines the uncertainty of admission or certification, the low earning potential and a general lack of financial aid for those considering teaching as a career with an emerging teacher shortage, a situation is created where passive selection processes are no longer sufficient. Aggressive recruitment will be required if the call for a few (more) able students is to be met. But even aggressive recruitment will fail unless changes are made in the workplace of teachers. Teachers must be treated like professionals, with the ability to control their work lives, advance through the ranks of their peers, and be differentially rewarded for their skills. Until this happens, a quiet but powerful self-selection process, which will nullify even the best recruitment strategies, will be at work.

Forgivable Loans

Economic incentives work. In a market driven economy, economic incentives signal young people about what occupations have high priority. Economic incentives allow students to consider occupations otherwise closed to them; such incentives attract students who might otherwise choose other occupations. Economic incentives in the form of forgivable loans will not by themselves insure a supply of able recruits for the teaching profession, but they will help.

Therefore the following recommendation is made.

****

RECOMMENDATION: The State of Indiana should establish a forgivable loan program for students preparing to be teachers.

RATIONALE: Many students elect careers other than teaching because the initial investment relative to the potential return is not in education's favor. This is especially true for minority students and those from low income families. However, no race or socioeconomic status has a monopoly on talent. The GI Bill brought a whole generation of talented young people into the colleges and universities. A system of forgivable loans could do the same for the teaching profession.

IMPLEMENTATION: As a single group the six COTEP institutions should urge the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to request that the General Assembly enact a loan program for students wishing to become teachers. The six universities should then actively assist the State Superintendent in supporting the measure with legislators. The loans should be awarded on the basis of ability and should have a forgiveness feature which cancels a portion of the loan for each year the person teaches in the Indiana public schools. Students should be free to use their loans to attend any teacher training institution in Indiana, not only COTEP institutions.

****

Attracting More Minority Students

The minority population of the public schools is growing rapidly at the very time when the proportion of the teaching force representing minorities is declining. All COTEP members report declines in their numbers of minority students in teacher education. The problem is serious and getting worse. Something must be done, and toward that end the following recommendation is offered:

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP member institutions should mount a cooperative recruitment effort to attract minority students to the teaching profession.

RATIONALE: A concern for equity, an essential element of our commitment to quality education, warrants increased attention to recruitment at the very time that college enrollments and completion rates for blacks are declining. The result of this condition will be fewer minority role models for students in our schools. Minority population in Indiana is clustered in a few locations such as Gary, Evansville, Indianapolis, etc. It is not likely that any single institution can mount a substantial minority recruitment effort. If member institutions cooperate, it is likely that minority students could be recruited to our programs and eventually replace the dwindling number of minority teachers in the profession.

IMPLEMENTATION: A Minority Recruitment Steering Committee composed of one representative from each of the member institutions should explore recruitment strategies. Such efforts should take into account the special information needs of minority students and should speak to the following: (1) the requirements they are expected to meet early in their high school career (perhaps as freshmen), (2) the form of financial aid which is available, and (3) how the universities are hospitable academically and socially from the perspective of minority students.

Obviously the recruitment of minority students is of concern to all teacher training institutions in the state as well as to the State Department of Education. COTEP institutions hope for and encourage their involvement as well.

****

Enabling Informed Choices

Once students have selected teaching as a career they must choose where to obtain their training. A college education is a major investment. Assisting student consumers to make informed

choices among options is a worthy goal. Therefore the following recommendation is made.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP institutions will communicate to state and national constituencies the quality and effectiveness of their teacher training programs.

RATIONALE: Students considering law or medicine have available brochures and other materials which contain data about programs and student performance at many institutions. As students begin to apply to such programs they are able to match themselves with programs where they believe they can have success and which attract students similar to themselves. The catalogues and bulletins of COTEP institutions contain program descriptions but do not include other potentially useful information such as how many of an institution's students passed the National Teacher Exam, the percentage of those who apply to teacher education who are actually admitted, the percentage of those who are admitted who eventually graduate from the program, the number of graduates of specific programs, the placement rates and types of positions obtained by graduates, etc. Such data would enable students to make an informed decision regarding their educational plans.

IMPLEMENTATION: A task force made up of faculty members from COTEP institutions should develop a set of indicators about which data could be collected. While each institution may publish data about its programs in any form it chooses, the intent of this recommendation is that as much similarity as possible be achieved in terms of the types of data reported.

****

Admission: The Next Step

Teacher education continues to suffer from the widely held belief that it is a major of last resort. "If you can't get into business, computer science, or engineering try education, they will admit anyone!" While this is perhaps overstated, it reflects

a common perception on many of the over 1200 campuses where teachers are trained.

Furthermore, admission to the teacher education program on many campuses is a non-event. So few who apply fail to be admitted that the admission decision is of little concern to students. For example, in 1983-84, 84 percent of the students who applied to teacher education programs in the 20 reporting institutions in Indiana were admitted. The numbers in the other Mid-west states were similar ("1985 Report to the Profession," 1985). To make matters worse, once admitted few students were ever selected out. In short, education was an easy entry, a safe major.

Permissive admission policies set into motion a number of unfortunate events. First, they allow marginally qualified persons to enter the training programs. The admission of these students reinforces the existing belief that education is the home of those who could not make it elsewhere. An even more damaging result, however, is that over time, education faculty begin to adjust course standards to fit the students in their classes. Professors, like teachers everywhere, get no satisfaction from failing large numbers of students. Thus, it is unlikely that any program or department having admitted students would then, through academic failure, force most of those students out of the program. The end result is to diminish further the reputation of the program. The gradual lowering of academic standards is not only a problem in schools, colleges and departments of education. As colleges and universities generally have moved both to make their programs more accessible and/or to avoid enrollment declines, they

too have lowered their standards accordingly. The fact that others share the problem, however, does not diminish it as a problem for education.

Until recently, the preceding characterization was a distressingly representative one. But the admission and retention arena has been one of the first components of teacher education to undergo change as reforms were undertaken. In some states, the legislatures mandated GPA and standardized test score requirements for admission to teacher education. Kentucky, for example, mandated a 2.5 overall GPA and a passing grade on The Comprehensive Test for Basic Skills as two criteria for admission to teacher education. Louisiana mandated specific NTE communication skill and general knowledge scores as part of the admissions process. Missouri mandated a minimum combined SAT score of 800 and a 2.5 overall GPA. Florida required that applicants to teacher education programs score at or above the 40th percentile on the SAT or ACT examinations. Oregon adopted the C-BEST test as an admissions requirement while California imposed the same test as an exit requirement (AACTE, 1985).

NCATE Standards

The recently adopted NCATE redesign established as a precondition to an accreditation evaluation that teacher education admissions criteria include a 2.5 overall GPA and the passing of a basic skills test (NCATE Redesign, 1985). Similar criteria have recently been made a part of the standards which will be employed

in granting state accreditation in Indiana. Therefore the following is recommended.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP institutions should move to bring their standards for admission to their teacher education programs into line with those recently adopted by NCATE.

RATIONALE: Prior to the adoption by NCATE of a set of new standards by which to accredit teacher education programs, COTEP institutions were raising their teacher education program standards. However, even with such changes all COTEP member institutions do not presently conform to NCATE standards. Since representatives of the COTEP institutions were among the leaders calling upon NCATE to move decisively to strengthen its requirements, COTEP members should now provide leadership within the state to implement the new standards. Among these standards are a test of basic skills, a 2.5 GPA requirement, and enforced checkpoints throughout the training program.

IMPLEMENTATION: Since the NCATE standards are already specific, member institutions can act independently to implement them. However, the recommendation which calls for the adoption of a common basic skills test should be a part of each member institution's plans as they move to meet the new standards.

****

Basic Skills Testing

Not only is basic skills testing one of the new NCATE preconditions, it is also strongly encouraged by the Indiana State Department of Education. The screening of students on the basis of their basic skills prior to admission to the teacher education program serves three functions. First, it identifies students who need remedial work in the areas of mathematics, reading and

writing. The early identification of those persons allows prompt remediation efforts to begin. Second, it sends a signal to academically weak students that education is not a place where students can mark time while they wait for something better or while they try to straighten out their academic lives. Third, it closes the program to students who are unable to overcome their basic skills deficiency and who would have little likelihood of passing the National Teacher Examination required for certification.

Therefore the following recommendation is made.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP schools should adopt a common test of basic skills.

RATIONALE: The new NCATE standards call for basic skills testing as one of the criteria which is to be employed in making the decision to admit students to the teacher education program. The adoption of a common test would insure that prospective teachers would not be able to slip into teacher education through a "soft spot" in the admissions process at a particular institution. It would also enable institutions to compare their candidate pools. Over time the existence of such common data would allow correlation studies to be conducted on the scores of the basic skills test and the National Teacher Examination.

IMPLEMENTATION: By the time this report is published, it is possible that three of the COTEP members (Ball State, Indiana State, Purdue) will have adopted the ETS Pre-Professional Skills Test as their means of screening students in terms of their basic skills. Since Butler University and the University of Evansville currently require no basic skills test it seems reasonable that the PPST be seriously considered as the test to be employed. Indiana State University, having more experience with the PPST, should hold a mini-conference for other COTEP member institutions during which it reports on its experience with the PPST. I.U. representatives should report what has been learned from using a locally assembled test package.

****

Other criteria for admission to teacher education programs are also changing, but not as rapidly or dramatically as those having to do with GPA's or basic skills tests. This probably is explained by the ease with which policy makers at all levels can manipulate quantitative criteria such as GPA's and test scores.

Establishing Classes

Lortie (1975) observed that teacher education is one of the few professions which lacks a "shared ordeal" which is an important socializing agent.

> The function performed by the shared ordeal in academia--assisting occupational identity formation, encouraging collegial patterns of behavior, fostering generational trust, and enhancing self-esteem--are slighted in classroom teaching. (in Lanier, 1984, p. 79)

As a result, most teacher education students go through their programs as individuals rather than as members of a cohort group. The failure to keep students together in identifiable groups was also mentioned by Schlechty (1985), who noted that education is one of the few professional training programs where students seem to flow in and out of the training sequence almost at will. This would be understandable if most programs catered to students who worked full-time jobs and took courses whenever they had the time or money. However, this does not describe most undergraduate teacher education programs. The majority of the teacher education programs are designed for full-time undergraduates who regularly take a normal academic load. In this case, there is much to be

gained by admitting groups of students as "classes" and keeping them together during their training. When coupled with tougher admissions standards, making the admitted group "the class of '92" would be an event of importance. Further, the idea of "class" would make subsequent transitions, as from first to second year, significant checkpoints with privileges to be gained. Ceremonies and rituals could be developed to mark progress through the program. Treating students as members of identifiable groups along with tightening admissions standards would benefit both the program and its image.

On the basis of these observations the following two recommendations are made.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP institutions should admit students in identifiable groups (classes) and keep these groups together as they progress through the teacher education program.

RATIONALE: Present training programs encourage students to drop in and out. Programs also expand and contract as the number of students wishing to enter them changes. The result is a very low level of professional identity on the part of students. They have little or no sense of having "made it" into a group of persons moving into and through a professional training program, i.e., they do not refer to themselves as "second year students" or "members of the class of 1988." This lack of group and professional identification further undermines an already weak pre-professional socialization process.

IMPLEMENTATION: COTEP institutions should announce in advance the number of students who will be admitted in a given "class." That number should always be slightly lower than the number of students who will apply for admission to that class. When students are admitted to a given class the training institution should make overt efforts to build class identity, e.g., giving each student the names and addresses of others in the class, holding an induction ceremony, prominently posting the names of the entering class, notifying local newspapers that "Susan Smith is one of 85

students admitted to the 1990 class of elementary education majors at ------- university", etc. Finally, once a class is formed its members should be kept together. Students should not be allowed to move freely between "classes" or enter classes in mid-stream.

This recommendation will be most easily implemented with elementary education, special education, and early childhood programs. Given the organizational structure of some of the member institutions it may be impossible to implement this practice with some secondary programs. However, the principle will be studied and implemented wherever possible.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP institutions should provide established, known, checkpoints at specified intervals in the teacher education program.

RATIONALE: Students in teacher education programs need some sense of defined and visible success as they progress through their programs. Checkpoints would provide opportunities for faculty to identify students who need to delay their training as they undergo remediation. Checkpoints would also serve as the basis for increasing the status of those students who successfully pass the checkpoints, e.g., second year teacher education students vs. first year students.

IMPLEMENTATION: Checkpoints could be established at the place where students begin the professional portion of their training, at the conclusion of the first year of the training, and at the point where students are approved for student teaching. As students pass each point, they could acquire different labels and different privileges. Checkpoint criteria could include GPA requirements, performance on tests of progress, departmental recommendations, successful field experiences, etc.

****

CURRICULUM

It would seem that when one decides to reform teacher education the content of the curriculum would be the first component to receive attention. But, as Catherine Cornbleth (1986) so aptly pointed out, that is seldom the case.

> Historically, organizational control has become increasingly rationalized and, to some extent, centralized while control of content and practice has remained relatively diffuse. Consequently, nationwide efforts to change tend to focus on organizational matters and to be largely technical or procedural (e.g., accreditation, credentialing, testing.). Sustained, substantive change in the areas of content and daily practice in teacher education is more likely to be locally initiated than effectively mandated by upper echelons or external agencies, although outside funding can be an impetus to at least short-lived, surface change in these areas. It follows that national reform efforts are likely to be technical, at least in part because that is the kind of change over which government agencies and teacher education organizations have the most control. (p. 12)

Philo's (1986) review of reform outcomes at the state level certainly confirmed Cornbleth's analysis regarding the focus of nationwide efforts. This principle led COTEP to elect to have a faculty Writing Team develop the first set of draft recommendations. The assumption was that those closest to where the change was to occur needed to be the most involved in that change.

The issuance of this report does not imply that the teacher education curriculum at the six member institutions is in disarray. Quite to the contrary. Before this project began, numerous program improvements had been made on an institution by

institution basis. The changes called for in some of the following recommendations already exist on some of the COTEP campuses. Other recommendations would introduce changes on all campuses. Implementing some of the recommendations will require significant changes at the program level; others will more easily be accommodated. The point is that the slate does not have to be wiped clean before the teacher education curriculum can be improved.

Basic Components of the Curriculum

The teacher education curriculum has three basic components: general education, majors/minors, and professional education. When one thinks of teacher education it is typically the professional education component that comes to mind. A widely held belief, even among professors, is that students preparing to be teachers spend most of their time taking courses in education. In fact, secondary and junior high/middle school majors take only five or six education courses in addition to student teaching. The remainder of their work is taken alongside students majoring in other departments or schools. Even in the case of elementary majors, the non-education portion of their training occupies over 50 percent of their college course work.

For elementary majors, the general education component of their program is also their major and minor. Because they will be responsible for teaching all subjects they take college level work in science, social science, the humanities, and the arts. Typically students would have from ten to fifteen credit hours of

work in each of these subject areas, a pattern often referred to as "jack of all trades, master of none." For students preparing to teach in secondary or junior high/middle school positions, the general education component includes a broad range of subject matter courses spread across the curriculum, approximately thirty to forty hours worth of work. The general education component permits students considerable freedom to choose from a bewildering array of offerings.

Secondary and junior high/middle school programs also require students to have academic majors and minors from areas in which they will be later licensed to teach, e.g., English, biology, economics, French, mathematics. Requirements for majors generally run between 36 and 52 credit hours, with minors in the area of 24 credit hours. The content of the major or minor is often set by faculty members in the particular departments within the constraints of state certification requirements. Requirements for majors are usually identical to requirements imposed on non-teaching majors. At the conclusion of their programs, students seeking state certification must first pass content examinations in their major(s) and minor(s). Non-teaching majors in the same departments face no such requirement.

Although there are general and professional education requirements, the majority of the courses taken by an undergraduate on his or her way to certification is neither offered nor controlled by schools, colleges or departments of education. Thus, if teacher education at the COTEP institutions is to be improved the entire university faculty must be involved.

The Liberal Arts

In this report liberal arts, general education, and majors/minors all refer to courses outside the professional sequence, courses often referred to as "subject matter courses." Courses in this category constitute from 50 to 80 percent of the undergraduate teacher education curriculum. It is the content of these courses that teachers are either accused of not knowing or of not teaching well. In the schools, no one teaches education but rather mathematics, social studies, science, music, etc.

The liberal arts portion of the college experience is itself coming under attack for being overspecialized and lecture/memorization oriented. The liberal arts curriculum is also portrayed as being dependent upon multiple choice testing and uncoordinated, the victim of uninspired teaching and increasingly located in the hands of foreign students who struggle with English (Holmes Group, 1986). Yet, it is this portion of the curriculum which conveys a powerful message about what it means to teach science, or mathematics, or history.

Memory (1985) quotes Muscatine on the importance of the liberal arts curriculum for those preparing to teach:

> (Prospective teachers) are, among all the students on campus, the ones who are not only going to take the curriculum but also to duplicate or perpetuate it. It is not only part of the college experience; it becomes a part of their life pattern. For other students, the curriculum on the college campus might be conceived of as a means to an end. For prospective teachers it is a means but it is also an end and a model. It, or some version of it, is what they are going to live with, live in, and teach toward. (p. 2)

After studying over 1000 classrooms, John Goodlad (1986) concluded that the emphasis upon lecturing which he found was not due to the fact that teachers had not been taught other techniques in their education courses. Instead, he concluded that they simply did not use much of what they had been taught as pre-service teachers. What his findings may demonstrate is that teachers have learned their pedagogy all too well, but from the wrong courses and models.

Much of the lack luster teaching that one finds in our high schools is simply a less than perfect copy of the teacher's own college course work. Not surprisingly, the teacher's forty or fifty hours of course work in the academic major had a more profound influence on how that subject was taught than the one or two methods courses embedded in the professional sequence. This alone would be sufficient justification for a hard look at the liberal arts portion of teacher education (Tom, 1985a).

But there is another aspect of the liberal arts which requires attention. What prospective teachers know about the subjects they teach is the responsibility of the faculty in the academic departments. Forty credit hours of work should be sufficient to teach a student enough English to enable him or her to teach competently 9th grade grammar or 11th grade American literature. But if the student is meeting departmental major requirements developed primarily for those heading on to graduate work in that field, 40 hours may not be enough. This is even more true of academic teaching minors where requirements often range from 15 to 24 hours of course work.

Unless academic majors and minors are carefully constructed, students may meet their requirements without ever grasping the essence of the discipline, its big ideas, its modes of generating new knowledge. In short, the forest becomes lost in the trees. Therefore, the first recommendation in this general area is:

****

RECOMMENDATION: Each COTEP institution should establish local committees which will reexamine the academic major and minor requirements for secondary and junior high/middle school teachers and recommend changes which will bring those requirements into line with the knowledge needed by students preparing to teach those subjects in the public schools.

RATIONALE: If teachers are deficient in the subjects they teach it is not because they lack the hours of course work which have been prescribed for majors or minors in those areas. Rather, it is often because such courses were selected on the basis of what those going on to graduate study in the department need to know about the subject. Little or no attention is given to making sure that courses are packaged and taught in such a way that students can grasp the overall sense of the discipline, the "how it works", and the excitement of its knowledge generation process. Yet these are the very qualities which professors often say are lacking in the way their subjects are taught in the schools.

Likewise, undergraduates headed into teaching careers have the right to expect that their courses will be well taught, that their professors will be models worthy of imitation and interested in how their subjects will be taught to young people. In some departments on some campuses this is already the case. In far too many it is not.

IMPLEMENTATION: On each campus committees composed of faculty members from both the Arts & Sciences and Education should be formed and charged with reexamining the requirements for the teaching majors and minors. What the prospective teacher will need to know about a discipline <u>in order to teach it</u> should be a major criterion for reconstructing the requirements. Attention should also be given to the quality of teaching which will characterize the newly developed requirements.

****

Elementary education majors present a different problem. The subject matter major for these students reflects the breadth but not the depth of the liberal arts curriculum. The student takes a few hours of mathematics, a few of science, fine arts, social science, etc. The problem is compounded by the fact that almost all of these courses are at the introductory level. Because students constantly begin at the beginning, they frequently find themselves in large lecture courses with machine-scored exams. Never do they experience enough work in any one field to begin to feel confident that they have mastered the subject. Fifteen years ago this lack of depth would have been characterized as a failure to learn the structure of a discipline. In retrospect the expectation for that level of student learning, at least within the instructional hours allotted, may have been unrealistic. Although it has been reported that elementary teachers feel confident that they know enough about the array of subjects they teach, a question remains. Could it be that they do not know enough to know that they do not know enough? Today we might be satisfied if students completed their programs with a proven sense of confidence about their knowledge and skills in at least one academic area.

In the best of all worlds, it might be right to require elementary education majors to minor in all the subjects they will teach. But given the workplace conditions and reward structures referred to earlier, this is not a realistic option. As a compromise, it seems more realistic to require of every student at least a minor in one subject area. But, and this is an important qualification, the course work making up the minor must meet the

same criteria discussed in connection with the previous recommendation, i.e., the work must give the student a sense of the field in which he or she is minoring. With that in mind the following recommendation is proposed.

****

RECOMMENDATION: Every elementary major should have experienced at least one discipline, preferably at the level equivalent to a minor. The academic work used to meet this requirement should include specially designed courses as well as courses from the regular Arts & Sciences (A&S) curriculum which have been specifically designated as appropriate.

RATIONALE: Curriculum decisions must be based on an understanding of what is to be accomplished by the curriculum. The intricate and sometimes subtle relationships among the various parts of the curriculum are often invisible to the person who has only a surface understanding of the material. An in-depth study of one curricular area can promote an understanding of how the components of that area fit together by providing the student an opportunity to examine the interrelationships among the various parts and the rationale for how these are blended into a coherent theme.

A random collection of A & S courses in a given discipline or curricular area will not meet the spirit of this recommendation. Many academic departments construct their requirements with their own majors in mind. While such course sequences may at times be appropriate for secondary education majors they are not what is needed by elementary teachers who must also be concerned with a broad set of curriculum responsibilities. In their cases the academic minor must be planned in such a way that the courses link ideas and modes of inquiry and help them see the discipline's "big picture." This is no small order if one has only 22 to 24 semester hours to invest. The identification of such courses will require the joint efforts of faculty members in Arts & Sciences as well as Education. Where existing courses do not meet the needs of these special purpose minors they should be created. Finally, it should be stressed again that this recommendation calls for more than a collection of academic courses which total the number of hours necessary for a minor. The pattern of six hours of this and eight hours of that no longer meets the needs of either teachers or their students. The term "minor" is intended to convey a level of understanding rather than some magic number of credit hours. Thus it is essential that the minors be planned carefully with the purposes of this requirement and the needs of the students in mind.

IMPLEMENTATION: For students preparing to be secondary school teachers, an in-depth study in one or more disciplines is already required. Therefore, this recommendation is addressed primarily to those preparing to be elementary teachers. While the number of courses will vary from discipline to discipline, whenever possible some upper level courses should be included among those recommended. When a given department in A & S is unable or unwilling to develop special courses, e.g., a course on the nature of the social sciences or a world history course, that responsibility should be given to the schools or departments of education.

As students select their minor they should be encouraged to concentrate in an area which matches those taught in the elementary schools, e.g., mathematics, general science, English, social science, art. Because of the differing departmental structures on the six campuses considerable local autonomy will be necessary as requirements for the various minors are developed. Thus, while the exact nature of the minors will vary across the six institutions the objective to be achieved should not.

****

The Education Curriculum

If the liberal arts portion of a teacher's training is the hidden part of the curriculum, professional education courses and field experiences are the visible part. Depending upon the student's major, professional education courses constitute from as little as 20 percent to as much as almost 40 percent of the undergraduate course work. These courses, along with the field experiences, bear the burden of training the student for a professional role, of making him or her different from regular liberal arts graduates.

Teacher education has been criticized by persons both inside and outside the education community. Many of these criticisms are valid. The recommendations presented in this portion of the report are intended to respond to these criticisms in a way which

has the likelihood of producing improvements in the near term, without waiting for major reforms in the public schools.

In general, teacher education has been criticized because it:

--lacks a unifying image of what a teacher should be

--is academically undemanding

--is too dependent upon common sense and anecdotal prescriptions

--fails to relate theory to the real problems of the schools

--lacks an agreed upon core of essential knowledge

--is fragmented, never the focus of student attention

--is overly dependent upon random field experiences

--fails to take advantage of the potential of new technologies

--has not kept pace with new social realities

--equates the completion of courses with actual skill development and knowledge acquisition

--assumes agreement on the primary goals of public education when, in fact, none exists

While the above list is not exhaustive, it does represent aspects of the teacher education curriculum which are addressed in this section of the report.

One of the forces driving bright young people away from teaching is the bureaucratic nature of today's teacher role. Unlike other professionals, teachers have little control over their workplace or those they must serve. Even in their present roles, however, teachers make a surprising number of job-related decisions. If the teaching role can be reformed, if the workplace

can be made such that teachers are treated as true professionals, then it will be increasingly important that teachers are skilled and thoughtful decision-makers. With that in mind, the first recommendation in this section is as follows:

****

RECOMMENDATION: A major goal of the teacher education programs at COTEP institutions should be to develop teachers who are thoughtful about their teaching and who make decisions on that basis.

RATIONALE: While classrooms may appear to be settings where routines rule, teachers in fact make hundreds of decisions daily which influence student learning. Such decisions touch all aspects of classroom life, e.g., what materials to use, when to move on to the next topic, how best to help a student who is having difficulty with a particular concept, how much homework to assign, how to deal with disruptive behavior, etc. The reality of the instructional setting often forces such decisions to be made quickly and frequently and with fragmentary data. Yet these decisions are the "stuff" of teaching. Despite its relevance and importance the decision-making process often fails to receive systematic attention during the training program. The result is a teacher poorly trained in one of the most essential skills of teaching, one who makes decisions on the basis of habit rather than upon the basis of thoughtful reflection.

IMPLEMENTATION: If students are to be taught to be thoughtful about their own teaching various professional courses should include case studies and simulations which confront the student with typical problem situations and give him or her the opportunity to make choices concerning how to handle such situations. The situations should be designed so that several acceptable solutions are possible, depending upon the factors that relate to the personal philosophy and current knowledge base possessed by the student.

****

The Science of Teaching

Among the more radical proposals vying for attention in today's education marketplace is the notion that anyone with a college degree should be allowed to teach in the public schools. An underlying assumption of this position is that if one knows his or her subject, teaching is then just a matter of common sense. A slightly less radical version of such a proposal would make drastic cuts in the portion of a pre-service teacher's training devoted to professional studies. Berliner (1985) has commented on the irony of taking such a position at this time.

> It is the worst possible time because there now exists a body of knowledge and a fresh set of conceptions about teaching on which to base teacher education. Recent and numerous advances in pedagogical knowledge can now, for the first time, be used to provide teacher education with a scientific foundation. (p. 7)

Indeed, some of the induction year evaluation programs, a topic to be dealt with later in this report, are based upon just such knowledge, i.e., teacher behaviors which have been shown to promote increased learning.

But in the rush to become scientific about the teaching act, one must also be alert to the limitations of teaching as science. As Rubin (1985) has written, teaching is part artistry, part performing, and part science. Students preparing to be teachers can be taught to act and to create as well as to employ scientifically based principles. The criticisms that too much time is devoted to teaching students common sense notions about teaching are not without foundation. What today's teacher

education programs must find is a reasonable blend of artistry, performance and science. Therefore it is recommended that:

****

RECOMMENDATION: Professional courses in the teacher education program should provide students with information about research on effective teaching (both its value and its limitations), as well as opportunities to observe, practice, and evaluate these behaviors.

RATIONALE: Over the past decade a substantial body of research has been produced to broaden our understanding of how children learn as well as the effectiveness of different instructional strategies. A body of effective schools research has also produced information, some of which is relevant to teacher education. Despite the fact that research shows that the effectiveness of instruction is linked to many factors such as grade level, the socioeconomic status of students, subject matter, and the goals of instruction, teachers continue to be taught and continue to use a limited set of traditional strategies which focus on lower levels of thinking. There is also little evidence that a common vocabulary associated with the findings of educational research is used by college faculty, students, and school personnel. In short, what we know about teaching has out-paced what we do about teaching.

IMPLEMENTATION: The solution to the problem of fit between what is known and what is taught is a complex one. Many journal articles and publications over the past few years have proposed curricular changes based upon this growing body of research. Course outlines need to be analyzed and the National Teacher Examination needs to be frequently revised to reflect the new knowledge. Those involved in the field experience and student teaching programs need to be kept abreast of changing knowledge and the criteria employed in evaluating the first year of teaching prior to the final certification recommendation need to reflect our best knowledge about teaching. Some of these tasks are best carried out at the local campus level while others can profit from a joint COTEP effort.

****

Theory and the Real World

If there is a persistent debate in professional schools of all types, it is the one involving the mix between theory and practice. Hines (1985) reported that there has been an on going struggle between practicing lawyers who want law education to stress more of the practical and law educators who want more theory in the curriculum. Students preparing to be teachers repeatedly ask for more relevant courses and experiences and complain about "all that useless theory." Teachers in the field reflect a similar concern with the practical rather than the theoretical.

Borko and Shavelson (1983) did indeed show that parts of the professional curriculum are overly rational when compared with how teachers behave. Their particular study focused upon teacher planning. They found that the highly rationalized lesson planning process taught in methods courses did not reflect how teachers actually do their own planning. Their findings represent only one instance where theory and reality do not match. Therefore, Borko and Shavelson recommended less emphasis upon objective-content-evaluation activities and more upon learning activities and subject matter.

Much of the "common sense" image of teacher education is a reflection of its overemphasis of the practical, of attempts to answer the question, "What do I do on Monday morning?" Professors continually work at trying to help students understand the connection between theory and practice, but not always with success. Frustrated students often fail to connect the two. What

is needed is theory taught in such a way that students understand its relevance to the problems they will face in the classroom. Toward that end it is recommended that:

****

RECOMMENDATION: Every teacher education program should include experiences related to how students learn.

RATIONALE: Curriculum decisions cannot be made in a vacuum. Many of the judgments regarding what to teach, when to teach, and how to teach are tied closely to the type of learner who is the target of instruction. The very heart of decision making is knowing the variables important to the decision-making process. Perhaps no other variable is so important as that of knowing the characteristic learning style of the student.

IMPLEMENTATION: The obvious implementation pattern would require a series of courses dealing with the psychology of learning, but other experiences should be tried. Seminars, on-site observations, case studies, video tape or video disk examples, etc., should be employed to help students learn to identify learning styles and to match teaching techniques and materials appropriate to them. These experiences should be planned by committees representing classroom teachers, education psychologists, and faculty representing other components of the professional education curriculum, including those responsible for the supervision of student teachers.

****

The problem of using theory to inform practice is also the result of the manner in which the two are interfaced in the curricular sequence. Applying theory to the complex web of decisions required of teachers in classroom settings is difficult at best. When theory is presented in big chunks and opportunities for translation are few the student is confronted with an almost impossible task.

In the past, heavy reliance has been placed on field experiences and student teaching, where students supposedly would see examples of theory in action. The results have often been disappointing. Gliessman (1985) reported research which helps to explain why students do not learn in the typical field experience setting. Students need to learn the theory-skill couplet in small segments and in controlled settings which afford opportunities for practice and feedback. As the students' skill repertoire increases, the setting in which it can be applied can be made more complex. As students gain confidence and skill, they can be given increasing freedom to begin practicing their craft. These research findings support the following recommendation:

****

RECOMMENDATION: Over the duration of the teacher education program the complexity of instructional environments should increase and students should assume increasing amounts of responsibility for performing in instructional settings.

RATIONALE: Broken down into its component parts teaching involves a host of highly specific skills. When these skills are blended with a knowledge of subject matter and a degree of artistry one has a teacher. But specific skills are better learned in controlled environments devoid of the multitude of variables operating in the typical classroom. It is only after the students have mastered specific skills in controlled settings (micro-teaching, simulations, etc.) that they should be asked to combine those skills in complicated settings such as the typical classroom. In short, the various skills involved in teaching should be taught and practiced first in controlled and somewhat simple settings and then gradually transferred to the more complex setting of the classroom.

IMPLEMENTATION: A COTEP task force should be formed and charged with cataloging the skills being taught in the programs at the member institutions and comparing that list to the skills called for in the Indiana version of the National Teacher Examination. Skills should then be classified, sequenced, and sent to local

committees which will compare them to the skills and sequence in use at their particular institution. Local committees should then modify the curriculum to conform with the principle outlined in this recommendation.

****

One way to provide students with opportunities to experiment in structured and less complex settings is to simulate the real world using some of the newer technologies. The military and some large corporations now use video disk simulations employing multiple outcomes to allow students to try out various responses to a particular situation. The learning outcomes of such film-like, student-controlled episodes are highly encouraging. The use of technology breaks the dependence upon unpredictable field experiences, reduces the cost of sending large numbers of students into the schools, helps assure curricular uniformity and makes available to students a range of experiences unavailable to most of them in the real world. Many of these same advantages led the National School Boards Association to support a proposal to develop SCI-LAB, a sixty lesson laboratory course involving video disk, computer-driven, simulated experiments (Mecklenburger, 1985). This is not to recommend that all field experiences be replaced with simulated ones. Rather, simulation can be used to supplement the field experience, leaving the limited number of field sites for those aspects of training which can best be accomplished in that setting.

****

RECOMMENDATION: Member institutions should jointly develop simulated experiences which are designed to supplement instruction and serve to facilitate the transition from the college classroom to the school setting.

RATIONALE: Simulated experiences permit prospective teachers to understand and analyze the teaching situation without direct contact with classrooms. Because the experiences can be controlled instructors can be assured that students will see specific situations which can be replayed for repeated analysis. The simulations also make it possible for students to see numerous examples of a particular concept, e.g., a teacher using higher order questions. Simulations, by isolating a variable, can make the teaching act more understandable. Recent advances in technology (video disks and small cameras) make this already proven teaching mode an even more attractive alternative saving "live" field experiences for use when more complex situations are needed.

IMPLEMENTATION: Member institutions should cooperate in the planning and development of case materials. The development of a common, extensive bank of materials in various forms (audio and video tape, video disks, print materials) would allow faculty to select materials which fit with their program objectives.

****

Case Studies: A Way of Testing Theory

Attorneys trained in California, Michigan and New York share something in common. They have studied classic cases which are benchmarks in legal history and which frame contemporary practice. The same can be said for students graduating from medical and MBA programs. The result is that these professionals share a set of taxonomies, understandings and terminology around a set of generic issues common throughout their profession (Broudy, 1985). The certainty and pervasiveness of this knowledge base enable any

individual professional to feel competent in providing an appropriate response.

The same cannot be said of educators. There has been little attempt to identify generic problems in education nor has the profession's best thinking about how to solve such problems been consolidated. Taxonomies not only abound, their creation is often rewarded as evidence of creative scholarship. Broudy (1985) concluded that, "Even textbooks, the unofficial authorities on curriculum, vary too widely to stabilize the field" (p. 7). He also attributed the lack of consensus on taxonomies, issues and appropriate responses to the fact that while education has been with us since the beginning of time, the field is only now in the early stages of becoming a discipline. He speculated that as the discipline matures its method of inducting new generations of workers into the field will become more standardized.

The case studies called for in the following recommendation should represent problems and issues so generic and so legitimate that all students at the COTEP member institutions should be familiar with them. Identification of the subject matter for the cases will not be easy. Once identified, a substantial task remains, namely the development of case packets built around a particular problem. Case packets need to be "thick descriptions" of the problem. They need to include any legal issues bearing on the problem as well as the theory or theories which are best applied to it. They should contain hypotheses regarding possible solutions to the problem as well as the profession's judgment regarding how we should respond. In short, the cases represent the testing grounds for the student's understanding of theory.

Because they are generic they represent situations which educators everywhere must face.

The following recommendation calls for the beginning of a process which will explore the development of such cases.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP institutions should cooperatively design and develop a series of case studies around generic problems/ situations which confront all students in teacher education. These cases should receive repeated attention throughout the training programs at all six institutions.

RATIONALE: Teacher training programs, while unique in many respects, must also prepare students to confront similar situations. Thus one can be assured that regardless of where the beginning teacher was trained he or she will face problems such as motivating uninterested students, dealing with students with special learning needs, working with highly confidential information, and trying to help students develop an international perspective. Case study materials in a wide variety of formats can be developed to assist in teaching students the profession's response to such situations or problems. However, the development of high quality, accurate materials in a variety of formats is time-consuming and expensive. It will be more efficient if the six COTEP institutions cooperate in the development of a core set of such case materials.

IMPLEMENTATION: A faculty team representing the six institutions should be formed to identify five or six cases which are deemed important in all six programs. Further, the team should determine not only the content of each case study but the particulars of format as well. For example, if film or video disk formats are included in a case the items should be compatible with the hardware in use on the various campuses.

****

New Social Realities

The culture of the schools, like the society at large, is in a state of continual change. One need only compare current conceptions of the family or the roles of men and women to those of two decades ago for graphic illustrations of this principle at work. Even if society were stable over time, sub-cultures across the culture vary widely. Inner-city black or Puerto Rican children bring a different set of values and needs to the classroom than do children living in middle-class suburbs. Since World War II, substantial gains have been made in insuring equal opportunity to all American children. Our progress has the potential to make us complacent, but complacency is a luxury we cannot afford. Those preparing to teach must be prepared to deal with these changing social realities.

****

RECOMMENDATION: Students preparing to be teachers should have a working knowledge of issues related to cultural and gender differences as they pertain to how students learn.

RATIONALE: Teachers will encounter students of differing cultural backgrounds. The school represents, especially to minority and culturally disadvantaged students, a contrasting culture. The classroom has been viewed by many scholars (anthropologists, sociologists, and educators) as a culture with specific norms, values, language and tradition. Moreover, many teachers will in all likelihood teach about other cultures. Equally important is the maintenance of the progress made over the past few decades in the opening up of educational opportunities to traditionally under represented groups. Both the cultural and the gender issues require extensive understanding before proper curricular decisions can be made.

IMPLEMENTATION: No specific prescription is indicated. Each member institution must decide which opportunities are to be made available to meet these goals. However, given the location of some of the member institutions, extensive use will be made of case studies, video tape and video disk data, etc., if minorities are to be studied in detail.

****

The Carnegie Report, A NATION PREPARED: TEACHERS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY, dealt at length with the change of America's economic place in the world. Once an industrial leader America has seen heavy industry progressively become the province of third world nations. The Soviet power plant disaster was a recent reminder of the way in which the citizens of the world are now interlocked.

Teaching teachers to have a world view is not the sole responsibility of the professional portion of the curriculum. Rather, it is a function of the student's entire undergraduate education and as such will require the cooperation of faculty throughout the university. Teachers must help children understand that we are now, more than ever, all in this together.

****

RECOMMENDATION: Teacher education courses at COTEP member institutions should include opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.

RATIONALE: The quote that follows is taken from a recent report by the Chief State School Officers (1985). It effectively captures the rationale for this recommendation.

> The United States is truly an international society. Our people originate in every part of the World. Our

> lives are a part of the global community - one joined by common economic, social, cultural and civic concerns. Education in these United States must prepare us to participate in this "global community." Virtually every part of education today should have an international dimension. We must assure that dimension is presented effectively throughout American education as we prepare students for the 21st century. (p.1)

To foster citizens who have an international competence requires that tomorrow's teachers be prepared in a manner that expands their vision of the world.

IMPLEMENTATION: This recommendation requires the attention of faculty and administrators at each COTEP institution. At each site appropriate strategies need to be developed to insure that the curriculum reflects an international perspective. In many cases cooperative efforts between the teacher education faculty and those in the departments providing the subject matter courses can result in the inclusion of material which furthers international understanding while also teaching math, biology, literature, and history. Overseas student teaching assignments also offer opportunities to broaden the international perceptions of some students.

****

Furthering Program Integration

Earlier in this section of the report reference was made to the three components of the teacher education curriculum: general education, majors/minors and professional education. It was pointed out that for secondary and junior high/middle school majors as little as 20 percent of their course work is devoted to the professional portion of their education. For elementary majors the figure is closer to 40 percent.

Schlechty (1985) has written about the low level of professional identity exhibited by students preparing to be teachers. For too many students, teacher education is nothing

more than a course here, a field experience there, and student teaching. At no point does the student feel like he or she is "in" teacher education, a participant in a program deserving full attention and energy. This is a different situation than that experienced by students in law or medical programs, where the break between the pre-professional and professional training is formal and dramatic. In fact, in order to achieve this same type of transition some have proposed that teacher education be moved out of the undergraduate curriculum entirely. Such a change would make the transition in teacher education exactly like that of legal or medical education but would also introduce another set of problems (Tom, 1985a; Hawley, 1985).

The following recommendation regarding strengthening program integration offers a way to achieve some of the advantages of post-graduate training programs without introducing many of their unique problems. By clustering professional training in two, three or four semesters students can be placed in program settings where all or nearly all of their time is devoted to professional course work and field experiences. Previous recommendations have suggested how admission to the professional portion of the training program can be made a major checkpoint supported by the appropriate ceremonies and rituals. The induction year recommendation which appears later in this report outlines a way that the socialization process, begun during the professional semesters, can be continued.

****

RECOMMENDATION: The professional portion of teacher education should be organized in such a way as to give it an even greater integration which causes it to become the focus of students during a part of their college experience.

RATIONALE: One of the current criticisms of teacher education is that it is no more than another undergraduate major which requires a very low level of commitment and which encourages stop-outs and drop-outs. Even students who have been admitted to the program have a poorly developed sense of belonging to an identifiable professional group. The program is often reduced to becoming a course here, a field experience there and all taking place while the student is preoccupied with the "other" portion of his or her college experience. The blocking of professional courses, sequenced in a critical fashion, would allow students to focus upon professional course work and allow greater scheduling flexibility. Blocking would foster group identity as students advanced together through a more intensive set of professional experiences.

IMPLEMENTATION: Member institutions should move to restructure their professional courses and field experiences into blocks (semesters) during which the student's program is devoted almost entirely to professional training. For secondary majors such blocks might represent the final three semesters of undergraduate work. In elementary and special education programs the blocks might begin with the junior year. While program formats will vary from campus to campus the intent should be the same, i.e., to structure the program in such a way so as to require the concentrated attention of students during a limited but intense portion of their undergraduate education. Admission to this part of the training program should be a significant event and those in the program should be easily identifiable to those in the program as well as those hopeful of being admitted.

****

Programs for Non-traditional Students

The warnings about an impending teacher shortage have already been mentioned. Much of this report deals with recommendations designed to make teaching attractive to a new and more able group

of undergraduates. But the number of new teachers which will be needed is such that it is unlikely that the pool of typical undergraduates will be sufficient to meet demand. A means must be found to interest additional groups of people, often referred to as non-traditional students, in the field of education.

Non-traditional students typically have needs different from those of the regular undergraduate. Many of the former group are older; they often hold full-time jobs and often have families of their own. Programs designed to respond to the circumstances of these students may look differently from the standard program situated within the undergraduate curriculum. Not all COTEP institutions will want to experiment with such unique programs nor will they all try to serve the same non-traditional student population. Diversity and experimentation, however, are the goals of the following recommendation.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP institutions are encouraged to experiment with programs designed to respond to the unusual needs and circumstances of non-traditional students, e.g., persons wishing mid-life career changes.

RATIONALE: People wishing to enter teaching by avenues other than through the undergraduate program are often frustrated by courses designed for the typical undergraduate and therefore do not elect to pursue a career in education. Yet, because of their experiences and commitment, these are some of the very people who have much to offer to young people. Making it more convenient for such persons to enter the profession could do much to attract qualified people into the profession at the time when a teacher shortage is becoming a reality. Let it be clear, however, that current attempts to arrange quickie certification for "anyone who wants to teach" is not what COTEP considers an appropriate response to the needs of special populations. Special should in no way be construed to equate with second rate or easy. Instead, special as used here implies different, but of equally high

quality. Graduates of such programs should be held to the same performance standards, core knowledge and skill requirements as graduates of "regular" programs.

IMPLEMENTATION: The six universities should develop and pilot test programs designed to attract different types of populations. Such programs should be designed to take into account the special circumstances and experiences of such students, without compromising program quality or integrity. For example, greater than normal use should be made of clinical and simulated settings in order to allow large portions of these programs to occur at times other than the traditional school day and year.

****

Developing Program Themes

Teacher education is composed of various specialized programs, secondary or elementary, vocational education or math education. These programs are almost always tied to state certification requirements, and they match either the grade levels or subjects taught in the schools. The recommendation which follows does not propose to change that program structure but rather to provide for alternative themes within the structure of these programs. By theme we mean a conceptual focus, not necessarily new courses or requirements. For example, a student might be trained in elementary education with an emphasis on how to meet the needs of gifted and talented students, or with an emphasis on how to prepare to teach secondary mathematics within a multi-cultural setting. It is the development of these more specialized themes that this recommendation is intended to encourage.

****

RECOMMENDATION: Where student numbers permit, a variety of alternative program themes should be developed within the structure of the teacher education program.

RATIONALE: In the typical teacher education program students encounter a variety of themes as they move from course to course and instructor to instructor. This variety can be seen as a strength of a program since it exposes students to a range of approaches present in the public schools. Students graduate from these programs knowing something about topics such as assertive discipline, the special needs of a particular cultural population, or the reasoning behind the back-to-the-basics movement.

However, another option for teacher education programs is to tighten the thematic focus by offering students the option of selecting sections of required courses which place special emphasis on a given theme or approach. Thus, while students would take the same courses, the conceptual focus would be different depending upon the theme of the section they selected. By careful section selection, the student could build a thematic coherence into his or her preparation.

IMPLEMENTATION: The development of thematic "strings" could occur when there are faculty who have particular competencies, and when there seems to be a demand in the schools for teachers with these competencies or orientations. Field experiences could be adjusted to stress a particular theme, and student advising materials could be developed to assist the student in pursing a theme throughout his or her program. The development of themes at any of the COTEP institutions is thus encouraged but certainly not required.

****

Better Use of Program Feedback

The Indiana General Assembly mandated the National Teacher Examination as one means of reassuring the public that teachers hold a verified body of knowledge and skills. Thus all persons seeking certification in the state must pass the required portion of the NTE. In short, the testing program is administered by the

state to meet state requirements. In the process, a body of data will be collected which can be of direct use to all teacher training institutions in the state.

The following recommendation calls for specific use to be made of the NTE results. Student performance on the NTE will provide universities with detailed data on how certain components of the training programs are functioning. This recommendation calls for such data to be used in a logical and comprehensive manner.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP universities should engage in a cooperative analysis of the results of the National Teacher Examination. This analysis of actual student performance on the test should be used as one basis for modifying training programs at the six institutions as well as being used to suggest revisions of the examination to the State Department of Education.

RATIONALE: Beginning in the fall of 1986 institutions will receive category-by-category feedback indicating how students from their respective institutions performed on various portions of the National Teacher Examination. Such data will provide a rich resource for evaluating various components of the training program, including general knowledge and knowledge in the subject majors and minors. Student performance data are one indicator of program effectiveness and will serve as one useful basis for program modification. Where test item construction is suspected as the reason for poor student performance, recommendations for changes in those items can be forwarded to the State Department of Education.

IMPLEMENTATION: No doubt universities will do their own analysis of test results and use these results to reexamine their own programs. A cross-institutional analysis will allow universities to capitalize on the strengths of programs at other institutions as they move to revise their programs in areas where their students perform below expectations. A confidential sharing of a chart showing test results by subsection and institution would facilitate program improvements.

****

FIELD EXPERIENCES

When one compares today's teacher education programs with those of a decade ago, a striking difference which emerges is the increased amount of time that students are spending in the field. Field experiences now begin early in the professional portion of the program and continue on a regular basis. Graduates evaluate this field involvement as one of the strongest program components. Field experiences provide the much needed reality check for professional programs in all areas.

Despite being praised by students, field experiences can still be improved. Recommendations in the curriculum section proposed that simulations replace some, but certainly not all, field experiences. A project in Iowa has demonstrated the feasibility of using television to allow teacher education students to "sit in" on classes in different types of schools (Hoy, 1986). However, some instructional goals can be met only by the use of live situations. The recommendations in this section describe ways of improving these situations.

Building Cooperative Arrangements

When the arrangements between schools and training institutions work at cross-purposes, both lose. But the real losers in such an arrangement are the students, who are pulled first this way, then that way. The result is a waste of state resources as training is negated; school people are frustrated to find students skilled at tasks which are seldom performed. Closer

working relationships are the only way to overcome this dysfunctional arrangement.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP institutions should take leadership roles in initiating collaborative experiences involving schools of education and cooperating school systems.

RATIONALE: In order to fulfill their mission of providing the best teacher education programs possible, COTEP institutions and the State Department of Education have joint responsibilities to provide funds and personnel for the development of collaborative programs involving universities and school systems. Since research data consistently substantiate the influential role played by field experiences in forming the teaching styles of prospective teachers, and since university methods instructors and classroom teachers are often in conflict in philosophy and technique, a strong argument can be made for closer cooperation of the university with school systems regularly serving as field experience sites. Concerted efforts could result in jointly planned programs which test practicality and promote innovation. Such programs could also lead to a cadre of master teachers certified by the state and prepared for on-site supervisory roles at varying levels of field experiences. Teachers could accrue post-baccalaureate credit from the university while the university programs accrue credibility in the schools.

IMPLEMENTATION: COTEP institutions should form collaborative networks with interested school districts. These networks should be built upon shared decision making and the notion that each has something to gain from the relationship.

****

Improving Supervision

Experience without insight is of little value. Sending students "to the field" without proper supervision does little to promote learning. If the only thing students see in the schools

are examples of how one should not teach or how schools should not function, then very little has been accomplished. Likewise, if university personnel linking the field to the campus are out-of-date in terms of what is being taught in the formal program on campus, then supervision itself becomes dysfunctional. Some of the pressure for field placement sites can be reduced by the use of simulated situations. In turn, a more careful selection of all the actors involved in the remaining field experiences becomes a realistic goal.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP institutions should initiate a plan to systematically screen, select, evaluate, and up-date all individuals (university supervisor, classroom supervisor, etc.) involved in the different levels of field-based laboratory experiences, including student teaching.

RATIONALE: Role models, either good or bad, have a powerful influence upon pre-service teachers. Thus it is imperative that persons representing desirable models be employed in those roles. In order to insure this competence only "certified" persons should be used in such settings.

IMPLEMENTATION: A set of criteria should be developed and used to screen persons from a larger pool of potential supervisors. Once selected, such persons should be evaluated periodically and provided with regular opportunities for refresher training.

****

Compensation

Generally only those teachers who are directly involved with student teachers receive compensation from the universities. The

many other teachers who work with undergraduates in a variety educational settings receive little or no compensation for their important contribution to the teacher education program. While the involvement of such teachers with students engaged in field experiences is less than that of those supervising student teachers, their contributions are no less important. They deserve to be compensated in some manner. Therefore the following recommendation is made.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP institutions should lead an effort to secure additional funding in order to compensate adequately in-service teachers who volunteer to supervise all levels of practica.

RATIONALE: In addition to student teaching, early and regular field experiences are now integral parts of the training programs at COTEP universities. While teachers are paid for their role in the student teaching process they typically receive no compensation for the participation in the other field experiences. At the same time, teachers are expected to engage in systematic renewal in the form of workshops, credit courses, etc. Certain types of compensation would both reward the teacher and make him or her an even better trained professional.

IMPLEMENTATION: Compensation for such participation could, for example, be made available in the form of university tuition waivers so that in-service teachers could continue to pursue their own professional goals as well as become a greater part of the teacher education team. Other university services such as ERIC searches, bookstore discounts, etc., could also be a part of compensation packages.

****

Selecting Field Experience Supervisors

The powerful influence of practicing teachers upon teachers in training is well documented (Jones, 1985). Unless practicing teachers work with field experience students in a manner consistent with what is being taught in the on-campus portion of the training program, students can become confused and discouraged. Therefore, it is essential that field sites and supervisors be chosen with care. It is also reasonable to expect that field-based supervisors will be evaluated periodically. The relationship between the field and campus components of the training program is not one-sided. As the criteria for the selection and evaluation of field-based persons are developed, both components should be involved.

****

RECOMMENDATION: Member institutions should enter into deliberations with cooperating schools for the purpose of setting criteria for the selection and evaluation of field-based supervisors.

RATIONALE: Field-based supervisors, typically classroom teachers, play a crucial role in the training of teachers. Because of their position in the real world of the schools, students preparing to be teachers accord them high credibility. Study after study documents that field-based supervisors have a profound influence on the teacher in training. Thus it is essential that the supervisors and the campus training program reinforce one another. If this is to be the case, field-supervisors must be true members of the training team and should participate in the broad range of program decisions, not only those directly related to field experiences.

IMPLEMENTATION: The criteria for the selection and evaluation of field-based supervisors should be jointly established by the schools and the university. The following guidelines should be

used to achieve mutually satisfying arrangements as an outcome of these agency-university deliberations.

--The criteria should reflect the level of involvement expected of prospective teachers in experiences such as observation, participation, practica, student teaching, and internships.

--The criteria should reflect the level of supervisory knowledge, skills, experience, and attitudes necessary to ensure proper supervision of teacher education students.

--It should be specific.

--It should lend itself to several processes for evaluation of students' and supervisors' effectiveness.

--It should insure that each supervisor possesses a valid certificate (not temporary or probationary) in the area(s) and at the level(s) of present instruction for which the university student is preparing.

--It should insure that supervisors of practica, student teaching, and internships have at least three years of successful experience in the area(s) and at the level(s) of activity at which the supervision takes place.

****

STUDENT TEACHING

Student teaching has been called the capstone experience of teacher education. Students say it is, "the place where the rubber hits the road." However it is described, research has shown it to be one of the most influential components of the teacher education program (Jones, 1985). The potency of the experience can, however, be a double-edged sword. A poorly supervised experience can actually negate previous training which makes the selection of the site and the supervisor absolutely crucial (Berliner, 1985). This is doubly true when there is no formal induction year program, i.e., when the novice teacher's first year of teaching is treated simply as any other year.

Given the consensus about the importance of the student teaching experience, it is curious that "...forty-four states have no formal credentialing process for university clinical supervising teachers, and twenty-four have no legal requirements for serving as a school-based supervisor" (Morris, et al., as quoted by Jones, 1985, p. 29).

The reluctance to require that school-based supervisors be certified may in part stem from the shortage of such persons. Jones (1985) concluded:

> It is not possible to separate the issue of quality and skill in supervision from that of numbers of teachers available. When even the most modest of expectations are applied it appears that there exists a severe shortage of master teachers who are prepared to assume the role of a school-based clinical supervisor. (p. 24)

In spite of the situation just described, the importance of the student teaching process prompts the following recommendation.

****

RECOMMENDATION: Member institutions should recommend to the State Department of Education that they jointly move forward in their efforts to secure licensing for in-school student teaching supervisors and that, as soon as possible, only those who have been properly certified be permitted to supervise student teachers. Qualifying for such licensing should include the completion of both instruction and internship experiences related to the supervision process.

RATIONALE: On site, school-based supervisors are a critical element in the teacher preparation process. Repeatedly, the literature indicates that field experiences, especially student teaching, are perceived by prospective teachers as the most powerful aspect of their programs. Whether future teachers receive quality supervision must not be left to chance. On-site supervisors need to have competence in facilitating the neophyte's professional growth and entry into the profession. They must be able to focus the future teacher's ability to inquire into the process of teaching and to grow as a decision-maker. The supervising teacher must also serve as an excellent model of good teaching.

IMPLEMENTATION: This recommendation requires the attention of appropriate officials at the Indiana Department of Education and the active support of the administration of COTEP institutions for implementation. Planning for the necessary instruction/ supervision for on-site supervisors should be the combined responsibility of cooperating schools and the universities. In addition, the university should provide tuition credit and/or other appropriate gratuities for a cadre of teachers who meet prescribed standards as mentors of student teachers. Arrangements for such course work and practica should not become an added financial burden passed on to the student teacher. Finally, cooperating school systems should build categories into their teacher incentive programs--salary scales, tenure awards, career ladders and master teacher labels--which recognize teachers who are licensed for and who successfully cooperate in student teacher supervision.

****

University Supervisors of Student Teaching

The university supervisor of student teaching is another key actor in the student teaching process. In some respects the role requires a more diverse set of skills than those required of on-campus faculty. Not only must the supervisor be attuned to the objectives of the training program and be able to recognize them in the behavior of student teachers, he or she must also possess the interpersonal skills needed to work with people in the field. This linkage role has not always been assigned high status or high rewards despite it's crucial nature. That problem too must be taken into account when the following recommendations are considered.

****

RECOMMENDATION: Member institutions should work toward improved university supervision of the student teaching experience. They should provide training which would enable the university supervisor to fulfill his/her responsibilities based upon knowledge of the campus programs, courses and learning experiences, as well as the school program, its philosophy and practices.

RATIONALE: Great care needs to be taken in implementing student teaching experiences. The university supervisor is a pivotal person in assuring the quality of this experience for the prospective teacher. Serving as they key link between the college classroom and the school classroom, this individual needs to be seen as a bridge between theory and practice, between the emphasis in the college classroom and practices in the school classroom. It is this individual who can insure that the classroom setting serves as a basis for prospective teachers to inquire further into the nature of teaching and as a context where they will further expand their decision-making skills.

IMPLEMENTATION: COTEP institutions need to provide the resources so that each university supervisor receives the necessary training

to fulfill responsibilities consistent with the following standards:

--The university supervisor has had teaching experience in the type of setting and area that he/she is supervising.

--The university supervisor is able to relate general educational principles to specific teaching practices and to facilitate the student teacher's growth in terms of inquiry into teaching and competence as a decision-maker.

--The university supervisor is able to establish a productive relationship with cooperating schools and to interpret philosophies and programs of the school so that the context serves as a basis for helping the prospective teacher gain insights into the educational process.

--The university supervisor is skilled in communicating desired outcomes of the student teaching experience to the cooperating teacher and is able to heighten that teacher's awareness of the most current, recommended teaching practices.

To implement fully the student teaching program, it is further recommended that the university supervisor make frequent visitations to cooperating schools (no less often than once every two weeks) and that these visits include meetings with the on-site supervisor and the student to assess progress. If not directly involved in the planning and teaching of general and specific methods, the university supervisor should meet periodically with faculty who teach these courses to become familiar with the instruction provided to insure that it be more explicitly related to the student's classroom experiences.

****

RECOMMENDATION: To bring more prestige and expertise to the role of the university supervisor in all clinical experiences, COTEP universities should develop a program for continual supervisory skill development and an equitable formula for assigning supervisory loads based upon a set number of student teachers per university work load credit, mileage to the field sites from the campus and number of students clustered per school. This formula should be recognized by other divisions of the university and be reflected in the promotion and tenure process.

RATIONALE: Traditionally, the university supervisory role has been filled by graduate assistants and those with the lowest rank in the university. These persons may be fully qualified in terms of recent classroom teaching experience but often lack an overview of the professional courses and seldom have the opportunity to meet in planning sessions with senior faculty.

IMPLEMENTATION: To upgrade the role of the university supervisor and to increase his/her influence, the supervisor should be in

regular attendance at faculty meetings in which course content and field experiences are planned. Further, the supervisor should have scheduled released time to visit methods classes on a rotation basis. Every attempt should be made to focus attention on the important role played by the university supervisor.

To be effective, a formula planned to take into account the essential role and the time-consuming character of clinical supervision must be recognized by other divisions of the university and be built into the promotion and tenure process. Opportunities for action research in the field setting should be highlighted and awarded equitable credit with that accorded "hard research."

****

INDUCTION AND CERTIFICATION

Induction Year Support

The fact that many new teachers leave the field after only three or four years is partly accounted for by the general lack of support provided to them in their first year of teaching. The lack of support is often compounded by conflicting socializing forces. Schlechty, George and Whitford (1978) have observed:

> The separation of the site of "formal" instruction and "formal" efforts at socialization (i.e., the university campus) from the site of the informal socialization and instruction is commonly recognized as one of the major problems confronting teacher education. Unlike training in law and medicine, where the social influences of the work place are viewed as a resource, in teacher education the social influences of the work place are seen as a "problem". (p. 319)

This first year, often called the induction year, has been criticized as a situation designed to insure failure. Both the current reform proposals and the education literature in general are full of specific proposals for induction year programs; some are formal to the point of course work and others are as informal as warranty programs.

The recommendation below does not presuppose the particulars of an induction year support system. In part, this lack of specificity stems from the fact that practicing teachers in the local school districts should be centrally involved in planning those experiences. Detailed specifications also depend upon what action is taken on the probationary year proposal, a

recommendation contained in the next section of this report. With this in mind the following recommendation is made.

****

RECOMMENDATION: Member institutions should form coalitions with local school districts for the purpose of planning induction year experiences which support and further the education of beginning teachers.

RATIONALE: The first year of teaching has often been described as a "trial by fire" or a "sink or swim" experience. New teachers often find themselves with the most difficult class assignments, with no formal support from their colleagues, and a total lack of contact with the institution where they were trained. The result is often a year of isolation and frustration when rather than continuing to hone the skills taught during the pre-service training program, the young teacher struggles simply to survive.

The induction year experience is further complicated by the lack of communication between practicing teachers and those who train teachers. This discontinuity is characterized by the often heard advice to the novice, "Now forget all that stuff they taught you in college and let me tell you how to make it out here in the real world." Thus the training program and the school often seem to work at cross-purposes.

IMPLEMENTATION: Member institutions should move to form coalitions with nearby school districts for the purpose of reaching consensus on a variety of matters, including the objectives of teacher education and responsibilities for inducting new teachers into the profession. The purpose of the coalitions should be to establish a structured set of support services and experiences designed to enhance the induction year for the new teacher. In addition, because each COTEP member places new teachers in schools all over the state, regional networks should be established to serve all the beginning teachers in a given area, regardless of their place of graduation. Such regional networks could serve all beginning teachers, thus facilitating one COTEP institution helping another. Whatever the details that are finally worked out it is essential that classroom teachers have a major role in designing and delivering the induction year support services.

****

Certification Testing

Colleges and universities have no direct responsibility for teacher certification, but their programs are shaped by certification requirements. The variety of certification requirements fills a good size book (AACTE, 1985), which continues to expand as requirements become more complex. Amid the complexity, however, there are patterns which are emerging.

Forty-four states now require or are considering some type of test before teachers are certified (Feistritzer, 1985b). While there are notable exceptions, e.g., California, the National Teacher Examination developed by the Educational Testing Service is becoming the national teacher certification test. The NTE is the test being used in Indiana. Students are tested in the areas of General Knowledge, Professional Knowledge, and in their majors and minors.

An earlier recommendation called for using NTE results in a diagnostic manner, i.e., as a means of identifying areas of program strength and weakness. The following recommendation calls for feedback to flow in the other direction, i.e., from those in the field to the State Department of Education.

If the Indiana version of the NTE is to have the highest possible validity, it is essential that practicing professionals (teachers, administrators, and professors) systematically review and suggest revisions of the exam. The scientific basis for teaching, state regulations, and the needs of the schools are constantly changing. The test being used in Indiana needs to

reflect those changes. It is toward this end that the following recommendation is made.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP universities should take the lead in calling for the formation of a committee which will analyze the current version of the National Teacher Examination and recommend periodic revisions.

RATIONALE: Due to legislatively mandated implementation dates the present version of the National Teacher Examination was adopted without time to consider carefully each item. This was especially true for the Professional Knowledge portion of the examination. The result is a test which is believed to be poorly aligned with current training programs. Such a belief diminishes the perceived validity of the test for both students and teacher educators.

IMPLEMENTATION: The State Department of Education should form a task force composed of faculty from the COTEP institutions, IACTE, ISTA, AFT, and other groups with a direct interest in teacher education. This group, in cooperation with the officials from the State Department of Education, should conduct an item-by-item review of the licensing examination and make specific suggestions for its revision in order to bring it into better alignment with what is held to be the knowledge and skills a beginning teacher should possess.

****

Probationary Year

Paper and pencil tests measure some things quite well, but the ability actually to teach is not one of them. This is not to say that teaching is beyond evaluation, in fact quite the opposite. The following recommendation focuses attention upon specific teaching behaviors and the novice teacher's ability to perform them.

A number of states, Wisconsin, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky and Kansas to name a few, have already implemented versions of a probationary year program. The programs in these states demonstrate that, difficult as it is, state level groups can reach a consensus on what it is that they want novice teachers to be able to do. That agreement constitutes the basis for the probationary year evaluation program.

In addition to protecting the public from people who are unqualified, probationary year programs also increase responsibility of educators in the profession for those about to enter it. By law the state is responsible for the final decision to certify school personnel. This recommendation would not change that. It would, however, broaden the pre-certification decision base and promote shared responsibility for the composition of the profession among those most directly involved.

This is the only recommendation in this report which would directly impact all teacher education institutions in Indiana. Its adoption would therefore have to follow a path different from those recommendations which can be implemented directly by COTEP member institutions.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP institutions should work with the State Department of Education to develop a new licensing pattern which incorporates a one year probationary license for first year teachers.

RATIONALE: Paper and pencil tests such as the National Teacher Examination can measure the extent to which students possess certain types of knowledge required by those wishing to teach. However, since teaching also requires the student to make a

complex set of decisions and perform a variety of tasks in a complicated social setting, the recommendation for regular certification should be withheld until such abilities have been successfully demonstrated. The present student teaching arrangement is sufficiently artificial and constrained so as not to fit the performance arena in which those wishing to teach should demonstrate their ability. What is needed is a probationary year during which the beginning teacher takes a full-time position for which he or she receives a regular salary. During this year the probationary teacher would be visited by a variety of professionals.

Entry into the profession comes at the conclusion of the probationary year on the basis of a joint decision involving the four major actors in the educational enterprise; practicing teachers, administrators, college faculty, and the state. A final certification decision in which all four groups are represented would help insure that only fully qualified persons receive regular certification as well as give each of the four professional groups greater responsibility for and identification with the new professionals. No attempt would be made to align the higher education representative on the team with graduates of his or her institution.

Obviously the process that is being proposed here would require the input of groups now only marginally associated with the final decision to certify the new teacher. This in turn will result in a process more expensive than the present arrangement. However, the cost would be moderated somewhat by the fact that only students actually employed in Indiana schools would be involved. Students who are not successful in finding employment in Indiana schools would instead have to meet the requirements imposed by the state in which they do find a teaching position. Those who elect not to enter teaching would also not be involved. These two groups of students would be eligible for probationary certification if they met requirements such as passing the National Teacher Examination, being recommended by the training institution, etc. However, the exclusion of both groups of graduates from the probationary year evaluation process would substantially reduce the cost of the proposed system.

The existence of a probationary year would provide valuable feedback to training institutions concerning the extent to which they had been successful in preparing the beginning teacher. It would also mesh successfully with the desire on the part of professional teachers' associations to have a greater voice in who is allowed to enter their ranks.

IMPLEMENTATION: A task force representing higher education, state teacher organizations, school administrators and the State Department of Education should be formed to devise a set of criteria and procedures to implement this recommendation. Since states such as Georgia, Kentucky, Florida and Oklahoma have already implemented somewhat similar plans their operations should be taken into account as plans are developed for Indiana. Whatever the content of the final plan it should somehow structure the process so that the final decision to recommend continued

certification is not only a joint one involving the groups mentioned previously but also one based upon the probationary teacher's ability to demonstrate good teaching practice.

****

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

The university reward structure neither facilitates nor encourages education faculty to be involved periodically in the schools. It is logical that one who teaches the principles of school administration ought to serve now and then as an acting or associate principal or that methods instructors be involved in a public school classroom. A few faculty are still able to touch the real world of the schools through laboratory school assignments, but that is not the case for most faculty members. Assignment to a school or other educational facility for a semester of full or part-time work is not considered an appropriate activity for sabbatical leaves, and it usually cannot be factored into calculating a faculty member's "regular load." The result is that a large number of faculty find it difficult or impossible to stay in touch with the environments into which they are sending their own college students. The following recommendation is intended to improve this situation.

****

RECOMMENDATION: COTEP universities should implement a program in which all persons involved in the teacher education process are given the opportunity to participate in some form of direct service to children. Assignment to educational facilities should occur every several years to insure that instruction and practicum supervision remain relevant.

RATIONALE: Some faculty who teach in the professional portion of the training program are out of touch with the world of the schools. Regular contact with educational programs would allow

faculty to provide more relevant instruction as well as provide a valuable service to the schools and agencies in which they worked.

IMPLEMENTATION: Member institutions should recognize participation in the world of the schools as a legitimate activity for sabbatical leaves. Where sabbatical leaves are not an option faculty should be provided with time off with pay during which they can participate in school life. Where no other arrangements are possible it might be feasible for faculty members to swap time off during the academic year for teaching in summer school without pay.

****

CONCLUSION

The recommendations contained in this report focus upon a set of realistic changes which can be achieved in Indiana now. The reforms we have proposed are substantial and within our grasp. To the extent that we are able to implement them our programs will be improved, our graduates better trained.

We are well aware that many of our proposals will require the cooperation of agencies beyond our six institutions. Some call for additional funding, e.g., forgivable loans, a probationary year. All will require the hard work and good will of large numbers of our faculty members and administrators.

It would perhaps be overly optimistic to expect that each of these recommendations would be fully implemented at each of our six institutions. Our pledge in developing them has been to guarantee their full discussion both on our campuses and in agencies such as the State Department of Education.

The files are full of reports which were forgotten soon after they were issued. In some cases their marginal impact appears to be attributable to their overly ambitious goals. Other reports have been victims of the "written by group A for implementation by group B" syndrome. We are not prescribing what others should do to improve teacher education. Instead, we focused upon what we, sometimes with the help of others, should do. Faculty members from our campuses were involved in drafting the recommendations. The opinions of other faculty members have been solicited in various ways and an Advisory Panel made sure that we kept ourselves in touch with their own perceptions of what is possible.

We are also aware that Indiana will be touched by the same national trends which are of concern to others. We are in the early stages of another teacher shortage. We have felt the pressure to fill classrooms with teachers, even if it means lowering standards. We will resist those pressures, but they will be there nonetheless. We already attract too few bright and minority students into teaching. Our recommendations call for action in these areas. Our graduates need to be even better prepared in their subject fields and equipped with skills based upon a rapidly growing body of educational research. And we must help our graduates feel better about having chosen teaching as a profession. The tarnished image of teachers and teaching must concern each of us, for we, too, are teachers.

Indiana does not fare well when compared to other states in the area of spending for education. We must work to change that, but we must also prepare teachers to serve the young people of this state in the meantime.

Some who have been anticipating our report are asking, "What happens now?" A fair question. The issuance of this report marks the beginning of the most crucial phase of the change process. While many have contributed to our recommendations, the real test of their merit and feasibility comes when they are considered by the people who must actually bring them to life. The discussion now shifts to faculty members, teachers, administrators, state department officials and state legislators. In one way or another each has a role to play if some or all of our ideas are to make a difference. We believe that what we have recommended can make a difference in the education of our young people. We hope others

will agree. In the best academic tradition, let the discussion begin.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AACTE. (1984). Teacher education approved by AACTE. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

AACTE. (1985). Teacher education policy in the states: 50-state survey of legislative and administrative actions. Washington, DC: Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Academy for Educational Development. (1983). Teacher development in schools (A Report to the Ford Foundation). New York: A.E.D.

Admission, retention and guidance of teacher candidates. Oxford, OH: Miami University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 072 038)

AFT chief endorses a national teacher examination. (1985, January 31). Teacher Education Reports, p.4.

American Council on Education. (1985). Recent changes in teacher education programs. Washington, DC: The Council.

American Federation of Teachers. (1984, May). Educational reform: The New Jersey experience. The New Jersey Voice of Higher Education, 1-47.

An agenda for educational renewal: A view from the firing line. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University, Peabody College, National Consortium for Educational Excellence.

Antes, R. L. (1985). Teacher education admission testing: Development and implementation. Bloomington: Indiana University, Coalition of Teacher Education Programs. Mimeo.

ASCD. (1985, December-January). Reshaping the teaching profession. Educational Leadership.

ASCUS. (1985). Teacher supply/demand 1985: A report based upon an opinion survey of teacher placement officers. Manhattan: Kansas State University, Career Planning and Placement Center.

Ashburn, A. & Fisher, L., (Eds.). (1985). Methods of assessing teacher education students: Conference proceedings. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Astuto, T. A. & Clark, D. L. (1985). Merit pay for teachers: An analysis of state policy options. Bloomington: Indiana University, Educational Policy Studies Series.

Barak, V. R. (1985). Effective classroom teaching in well structured areas. Chicago, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboartory.

Barnes, D. W. (1985). Craftsmen and scholars: The case for academic majors in teacher education. Bloomington: Indiana University, Coalition of Teacher Education Programs. Mimeo.

Beck, J. J. Jr. (1980, November 5). Computer literacy for elementary and secondary teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Texas ASCD, Houston, TX.

Benchmarks of excellence: Recommendations of the University of Wisconsin system task force on teacher education. (1984). Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Berliner, D. C. (1985). Reform in teacher education: The case for pedagogy. Washington, D.C.: ACSESULGC. Mimeo.

Borko, H. & Shavelson, R. J. (1983, October). Speculations on teacher education: Recommendations from research on teachers' cognitions. Journal of Education for Teaching, 9(3), 210-224.

Boyer, E. (1984, November 28). School reform: Regulation or renewal? Education Week, p. 19.

Brophy, J. & Kher, N. (1985, February). Teacher socialization as a mechanism for developing student motivation to learn. (Research Series No. 157). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Broudy, H. S. (1985). The case for case studies in teacher education. Bloomington: Indiana University, Coalition for Teacher Education Programs. Mimeo.

Carlson, R. E. (1985). The impact on preparation institutions of competency tests for educators. Mimeo.

Clark, D. L. (1984). Transforming the structure for the professional preparation of teachers. In L. G. Katz & J. D. Raths (Eds.), Advances in Teacher Education, Volume II (pp. 1-19). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Commissioner Ambach sets NTE core battery test scores. (1984, Fall). Teacher Education Conference Board Newsletter, 6(2), p.1.

Commissioner: Higher education funding available. (1986, May 22). Bloomington Herald Telephone, p. 5.

Cornbleth, C. (1986, April). Ritual & rationalilty in teacher education reform. Educational Researcher, 5-14.

Corrigan, D. C., Palmer, D., & Alexander, P. (1982). The future of teacher education: Needed research and practice. College Station: Texas A & M University.

Damerell, R. G. (1985). Education's smoking gun: How teachers colleges have destroyed education in America. New York: Freundlich Books.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1984). Beyond the commission reports: The coming crisis in teaching. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Defino, M. E. & Hoffman, J. V. (1985). A status report and content analysis of state mandated teacher induction programs. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. Mimeo.

Education majors borrow less, but teaching often is not primary interest. (1986, June 5). Teacher Education Reports, p. 7.

Education Turnkey Systems, Inc. (1985). Use of computers in education (RR-85-07). Washington, DC: Research Report Series, National Commission for Employment Policy.

Educational Testing Service. (1982). Teacher competence. (Focus #10). Princeton, NJ: ETS.

Emans, R. (1984, November). Policies for improving schools in South Dakota: The financial and knowledge resources. Public Affairs, (No. 90). Vermillion: The University of South Dakota.

ERIC resources on teacher induction. (1986, January-February). Journal of Teacher Education, 35-37.

Evertson, C., Hawley, W., & Zlotnik, M. (1984). The characteristics of effective teacher preparation programs: A review of research. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University, Peabody Center for Effective Teaching.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Buchmann, M. (1985). The first year of teacher preparation: Transition to pedagogical thinking? East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching. Mimeo.

Feistritzer, C. E. (1983). The American teacher. Washington, DC: Feistritzer Publications.

Feistritzer, C. E. (1984). The making of a teacher: A report on teacher education and certification. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Information.

Feistritzer, C. E. (1985a, August 1). Commentary by the publisher. Teacher Education Reports, pp. 6-7.

Feistritzer, C. E. (1985b). The condition of teaching: A state by state analysis, 1985. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Fox, G. T. (1983). Challenging how teachers are educated: A source for dialogue and action. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 228 160)

Freeman, D. (1986). Overview: Program evaluation in the colleges of education at Michigan State University (Program Evaluation Series #10). East Lansing: Michigan State University. Mimeo.

From drill sergeant to intellectual assistant: Computers in the schools. (1985, Summer-Fall). Carnegie Quarterly, 1-7.

Futrell lashes out.... (1985, September 12). Teacher Education Reports, pp. 4-5.

Futrell shares views on teacher pay, urges revamped training programs. (1986, June 5). Teacher Education Reports, pp. 1-6.

Galambos, E. C. (1984). Testing teachers for certification and recertification. Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 299)

Galambos, E. C. (1985). Teacher preparation: The anatomy of a college degree. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Garcia, P. A. (1985). A study on teacher competency testing and test validity with implications for minorities and results and implications of the use of the PPST as a screening device for entrance into teacher programs in Texas. Edinburg, TX: Pan American University.

Garcia, P. A. (1985, Fall). The promise of a national test for teachers. Teacher Education and Practice, 2(2), 45-46.

Gibney, T. (1981, May 6). Teaching concepts: Implications for teacher development. Columbus, OH: Teaching Concepts Research Project. Paper presented at the Division of Inservice Education Renewal Conference, May 6, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 204 315)

Gideonse, H. (1983). In search of more effective service: inquiry as a guiding image for educational reform in America. Cincinnati, OH: S. Rosenthal and Company, Inc.

Gideonse, H. D. (1984). A future role for liberal arts colleges in the preparation of teachers. In A. Tom (Ed.), Teacher education in liberal arts settings: Achievements, realities and challanges (pp. 1-11). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education.

Gimeno, J. B. & Ibanez, R. M. (1981). The education of primary and secondary school teachers: An international comparative study. Verdome, France: The UNESCO Press.

Givens, S. (1986, May-June). Holmes group report gains praise, but stirs dissension. AACTE Briefs, 7(4), pp. 1+.

Gliessman, D. H. (1985). Laboratory methods in teacher training: Their rationale and use. Bloomington: Indiana University, Coalition of Teacher Education Programs. Mimeo.

Goldberg, D. (1985, January 6). Attracting the best with incentive plans. The New York Times, Section 12.

Goodlad, J. (1986). Speech before the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Chicago, IL.

Griffen, G. A. (1982, January). Issues in student teaching: People, interactions, contexts. Austin: University of Texas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 223 577)

Griffin, G. A. (1984). Crossing the bridge: The first years of teaching. Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 292)

Guidelines: Teacher internship of the Wisconsin improvement program. (1985). Madison: The University of Wisconsin.

Guyton, E. & Antonelli, G. A. (1985, Spring). Revitalization of the image of teacher education: Priorities and activities of educational leaders. The SCACTE Journal, 9(9), 47-55.

Haberman, M. (1986, June). Licensing teachers: Lessons from other professions. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(10), 719-722.

Hackley, L. V. (1985, Fall). The decline in the number of black teachers can be reversed. Educational Measurement, 17-19.

Hall, G., et al., (1984). The schools and preservice education: Expectations and reasonable solutions. Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 294)

Hall, G. E. (1986). Beyond the looking glass: Recommendations & critical warnings for teacher education practitioners, policymakers & researchers. Austin: University of Texas, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Haisley, F. B., Gilberts, R. D. & Kehl, E. M. (1983). A planning document for revised elementary and secondary teacher preparation programs. Eugene: University of Oregon. Mimeo.

Hawley, W. D. (1985). Breaking away: The risks and inadequacy of extended teacher preparation programs. Nashville, TN: Peabody Center for Effective Teaching, Vanderbilt University.

Hawley, W.D. (1986, June). Toward a comprehensive strategy for addressing the teacher shortage. Phi Delta Kappa, 67(10), 712-718.

Herron, J. D. (1985). Advice for the talent scout. Bloomington: Indiana University, Coalition of Teacher Education Programs. Mimeo.

Hines, N. W. (1985, March). Remarks for AERA Symposium. Mimeo.

Hoard, S. M., O'Neal, S. F., & Smith, M. L. (Eds.). (1985). Beyond the looking glass. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hodgkinson, H.L. (1986, April). What's ahead for education. Principal, 6-11.

Hoffmen, J.V. (1986, January-February). A study of state-mandated beginning teacher programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 16-21.

Holmes Group. (1986). A report of the Holmes Group: Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, Inc.

Holt, L. & Peterson, K. (1981, Winter-Spring). University and public school cooperation for professional growth. Action in Teacher Education, 3(1), 65-75.

Houston, W. R. (1986). Mirrors of excellence: Reflections for teacher education from training programs in ten corporations and agencies. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Howey, K. R. & Gardner, W. E. (1983). The education of teachers: A look ahead. New York, NY: Longman Inc..

Howey, K. R., Matthes, W., & Zimpher, N. (1985). Issues and problems in professional development. (First Draft) Chicago, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. Mimeo.

Hoy, M. P. (1986, May). Teacher on television. Paper prepared for Satellite Systems Conference, Omaha, NB. Mimeo.

Hungerman, A. D. & Berger, C. F. (1980). Longitudinal assessment of instructional competency: Three stages of preservice professional development. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. Mimeo. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 214 901)

Indiana Farm Bureau. (1986). School statistical report: 1986. Indianapolis, IN: The Bureau.

Indiana State Department of Education. (1986). Indiana schooling for the twenty-first century. (Draft) Indianapolis, IN: The Department.

Jacobson, R. L. (1985, July 10). NEA backs written tests to certify new schoolteachers. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 30(19), p. 2.

Jones, D. W. (1985). Successful teacher education programs depend upon cooperative relationships between public/ private schools and colleges and universities. Bloomington: Indiana University, Coalition of Teacher Education Programs. Mimeo.

Joyce, B. & Clift, R. (1984, April). The phoenix agenda: Essential reform in teacher education. Educational Researcher, 5-19.

Kanter, R. M. (1983). The change masters: Innovation for productivity in the American corporation. New York, NY: Simon and Shuster.

Klausmeier, H., Lezotte, L., & Shive, J. (1985). School improvement through networking. Chicago, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboartory. Mimeo.

Korth, W. & Ferrgro, G. (1983). Ascertaining learning needs of students entering upper level teacher education programs. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Lake, S. (1984). The educator's digest of reform: A comparison of 16 recent proposals for improving America's schools. Redwood City, CA: SMERC Information Center, San Mateo County Office of Education.

Lanier, J. E. (1984). Research on teacher education. (Occasional Paper No. 80). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching. Mimeo.

Lieberman, M. (1986, June). Privatization and public education. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(10), 731-734.

Loan forgiveness programs less than successful in attracting new teachers. (1986, April 24). Teacher Education Reports, pp. 6-7.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lorti, D. & Cyphert, T. (1985). A NCREL advisory paper on professional development: Inservice education. Chicago, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboartory. Mimeo.

Low pay, high stress prompt teachers to seek new jobs. (1986, March 27). Teacher Education Reports, pp. 3-4.

Maeroff, G. (1985, January 6). Improving our teachers: Who should be trained, and how, is focus of national move to rebuild the profession. The New York Times, Section 12, p. 1+.

McCann, P. H. (1985). Improving professional development: Problems and progress. Chicago, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. Mimeo.

McDaniel, C. (1985). Performance-based certification. In S. Hoard (Ed.), Beyond the looking glass (pp. 239-252). Austin: University of Texas.

Martin, E. R. (1983, January-February). Who are our teacher education students? Journal of Teacher Education, 34(1), 51-53.

Mecklenburger, J. A. (1985). The transfer of new technologies to education. In S. K. Majumndar (Ed.), The Proceedings, Directory and Handbook of the National Association of Academies of Science 1985-86 (pp. 22-31). Washington, DC: NAAS. Symposium: Future Educational Delivery Systems: Technology in Education. NAAS/AAAS, May 29, 1985, Los Angeles, CA.

Mecklenburger, J.A. (1986, June). A diamond in the rough? Phi Delta Kappan, 67(10), 735-737.

Memory, D. M. (1985). Liberal studies in teacher education. Bloomington: Indiana University, Coalition of Teacher Education Programs. Mimeo.

Meyer, E. J. (1986, June). A radical proposal for teacher preparation. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(10), 728-730.

Mickler, M. L. (1985, Winter). Beyond credentials in teacher selection: A validation study of the Omaha teacher interview. NCA Quarterly, 59(3), 339-345.

Minnesota panel calls for teacher education changes. (1986, November 28). Education Week, p. 14.

Morey, A. I. (1983). Excellence in professional education: A report of the advisory committee to study programs in education in the California State University. Long Beach: The California State University.

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1984). Policy options for quality education. Alexandria, VA: NASBE.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1984, November). Occupational aspirations and intended field of study in college. (Contractor Report). Oxford, OH: Miami University.

National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. (1985). A call for change in teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

NASULCG paper outlines teacher education changes. (1984, December). AACTE Briefs, 5(10), p. 5.

National Council of Teachers of English. (1986). Guidelines for the preparation of teachers of English language arts. Urbana, IL: The Council.

National Education Association. (1982). Excellence in our schools, teacher education: An action plan. Washington, DC: The Association.

NCATE redesign. (1985). Washington, D.C.: NCATE. Mimeo.

Nearly half of applicants fail S.C. teacher test. (1985, January 9). Education Week, p. 3.

New Jersey board approves rigid rules in new teacher certification standards. (1982, August 19). Teacher Education Reports, pp. 7-8.

1985 report to the profession: Data show.... (1985, Autumn). AACTE Briefs, 6(6), p. 1-13.

Olsen, P. (1975). Teacher education in America. Washington, DC: Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers.

Peseau, B. A. (1981). Third annual academic production and funding study of teacher education programs in state universities and land grant colleges 1979-1980. Montgomery: University of Alabama, NCSESULGC.

Phi Delta Kappa. (1984). Teacher certification. Bloomington, IN: PDK, Center on Evaluation, Development, Research.

Phi Delta Kappa. (1985). Student competency testing. Bloomington, IN: PDK, Center on Evaluation, Development, Research.

Philo, C. (1986, June). Education reform--it looks like a keeper. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(10), 701-702.

Politicians, teachers in 2 states wrangle over incentive plans. (1985, May 22). Education Week, IV(35), p. 1+.

PRO*FILE: A professional development process for future teachers. (1985). Ames: Iowa State University, College of Education. Brochure.

Raywid, M. A., Tesconi, C. & Warren, D. (1985). Pride and promise: Schools of excellence for all the people. Westbury, NY: American Education Studies Association.

Reading commission optomistic about potential. (1985, May). AACTE Briefs, 6(4), p. 1.

Recommendations for changes in education of teachers emerge from study of college transcripts. (1985, June 24). Education Times, p. 5.

Reed, S. (1985, January 6). Education courses: Are they useful? The New York Times, Section 12, p. 36+.

Research and Policy Committee. (1985). Investing in our children: Business and the public schools. New York, NY: Committee for Economic Development.

Rice, R. (1984). Toward reform in teacher education: Strategies for change. Racine: WI, The Johnson Foundation and The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

Rosenshine, B., Harnischfeger, A. & Walberg, H. (1985). Classroom programs for school improvement: An advisory paper for the North Central Regional Educational Lab. Chicago, IL: The Laboratory. Mimeo.

Rosner, F. & Grandy, J. (1982). The national teacher examination commons revision survey. Princton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 518)

Ross, S. M., et al. (1980, November-December). Field experiences for teacher candidates: A comparison between tutorial and apprenticeship programs on student activities and attitudes. Journal of Teacher Education, 31(6), 57-61.

Roth, R. (1986, June). Emergency certificates, misassignment of teachers, and other 'dirty little secrets'. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(10), 725-727.

Rubin, L. J. (1985). Artistry in teaching. New York, NY: Random House.

Ruel, A. & Stanton, C. M. (1984). Excellence in teacher education: The liberal arts college perspective. In A. Tom (Ed.), Teacher education in liberal arts settings: Achievements, realities and challenges (pp. 13-20). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education.

Sandefur, J. (1985, March). State assessment trends. AACTE Briefs, 6(2), pp. 21-23.

Schlechty, P. C., George, J., & Whitford, B. (1978, April). Reform in teacher education and the professionalization of teaching. The High School Journal, 313-320.

Schlechty, P. C. & Vance, V. S. (1982). Recruitment, selection and retention: The shape of the teaching force. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 541)

Schlechty, P. C. & Vance, V. (1983, October). Institutional responses to the quality/quantity issue in teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(2), 94-101.

Schlechty, P. C. (1985). Reform in teacher education: A sociological view. Bloomington: Indiana University, Coalition of Teacher Education Programs. Mimeo.

Schlechty, P. C. (1986, January-February). A framework for evaluating induction into teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 37-41.

Smith, D. C. (1983). Essential knowledge for beginning teachers. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Smith, D. & Imig, D. (1984, November 28). Public dilemma: Equity vs. excellence. Education Week, pp. 20-21.

Southern Regional Education Board. (1985). Improving teacher education: An agenda for higher education and the schools. Atlanta, GA: The Commission on Education.

Spero, I. (1986). The use of student financial aid to attract prospective teachers: A survey of state efforts. Washington, DC: The College Board.

State education statistics: State performance outcomes. (1985, January 19). Education Week, pp. 12-13.

Stodolsky, S. S. (1984, November). Teacher evaluation: The limits of looking. Educational Researcher, 11-17.

Sykes, G. (1983, October). Contradictions, ironies and promises unfulfilled: A contemporary account of the status of teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(2), 87-93.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Corporation, Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Teacher trainers must demonstrate effective practices, NCTE study warns. (1986, April 24). Teacher Education Reports, pp. 3-4.

Teaching without preparation: A Washington state report examines out-of-field assignments. (1985, June 10). Education Times, p. 5.

The year in review: Top 10 education news events of 1985. (1986, January 2). Education Daily, pp. 3+.

Toch, T. (1984, December 5). Teacher-shortage realities seen thwarting reform. Education Week, IV(14), p. 1+.

Tom, A. R. (1985a). Teacher education in liberal arts settings: Achievements, realities and challenges. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Tom, A. R. (1985b). The case for keeping teacher education at the undergraduate level. Bloomington: Indiana University, Coalition of Teacher Education Programs. Mimeo.

Torney-Purta, J. (1986). Predictors of global awarness and concern among secondary school students. Columbus, OH: Mershon Center, Ohio State University.

Wagenar, T. (n.d.). Occupational aspirations and intented field of study in college (Stock No. 065-000-00217-5). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Warren, S. (1985). Minorities in Teacher Education. Bloomington: Indiana University, Coalition of Teacher Education Programs. Mimeo.

Weaver, W. T. (1984, Nobember). Solving the problem of teacher quality, part 2. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(3), 185-188.

Weinholtz, D. (1985). The medical education paradigm: Insights for teacher preparation. Paper presented at the AERA symposium, Chicago, IL. Mimeo.

What's wrong with our teachers? (1983, March 14). U.S. News and World Report, 94(10), 37-41.

Why teachers fail: How to make them better. (1984, September 24). Newsweek, CIV(13), 64-70.

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSION REGARDING THE PROPOSAL TO PLACE TEACHER EDUCATION AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL

SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSION REGARDING THE PROPOSAL TO PLACE TEACHER EDUCATION AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL

Numerous recent reform proposals have recommended that teacher education programs be moved to the graduate level. This proposal was discussed at great length during the preparation of this report. The final decision was to recommend improvements in teacher education while leaving those programs at the undergraduate level.

Proponents of abolishing undergraduate teacher education claim numerous advantages for that strategy. Readers interested in the fullest development of those arguments are referred to TOMORROW'S TEACHERS (Holmes Group, 1986) and A NATION PREPARED: TEACHERS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986). In summary form, the arguments for abolishing undergraduate teacher education in favor of graduate level teacher education are:

--Requiring students to complete a baccalaureate degree prior to admission to teacher education would insure that each student would have completed an academic major of some sort. The successful completion of such a course of study would strengthen the academic self-concept of the students, insure their command of at least one body of knowledge, and weed-out those who were academically weak.

--Requiring an additional one or two years of study would eliminate students who are only marginally committed to the field

of education. As a result, a higher percentage of the graduates of five or six year programs would actually enter the teaching profession.

--Placing training programs at the graduate level would give the professional schools greater control over the students' schedules, as students would be enrolled exclusively in professional courses. Having total program control would allow the development of clinical and internship experiences not possible when education courses are mixed with other undergraduate courses.

--Separating teacher education from the undergraduate experience would make it similar to other professional training experiences such as law and medicine. The demarcation from undergraduate to graduate education would be dramatic. Students would feel a sense of professional identification with others in their entering class.

--Graduate level teacher training would command greater respect for education, both on and off the campus.

--Graduate level training would be specialized, allowing students to prepare for the differentiated staffing roles which will be needed if schools are to be restructured.

--Graduate students are more mature and career-oriented than undergraduates, thus facilitating the development of more sophisticated and demanding training procedures.

--The business of preparing teachers at the graduate level would leave that function in the hands of the institutions best suited to do it.

While some of these arguments are more compelling than others, all were considered. Each was examined in the context of the needs of schools in Indiana as well as within the missions of the COTEP institutions. In the final analysis, the idea of shifting teacher education to the graduate level at the COTEP institutions was rejected for the following reasons:

--The conditions needed to justify and support extended training programs would require massive changes throughout education. State departments of education would need to adopt new certification patterns. School systems would need to adopt career ladders and differentiated staffing. State legislatures and local taxpayers would need to approve increased expenditures for education. Teachers' associations would have to modify their positions regarding teacher pay, seniority, job descriptions, etc. Both the Holmes Group (1986) and the Carnegie Commission (Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986) have stated that all of these changes will have to occur if graduate level training programs are to succeed. Yet there is no compelling evidence that there is support for such wide-ranging changes in Indiana. The "necessary conditions" do not now exist nor are they likely to exist in the foreseeable future.

--Many of the advantages claimed by proponents of extended training programs can also be achieved within the context of the undergraduate curriculum. Readers will note that among our recommendations are those calling for cohort group admission, higher admission standards, academic minors for elementary majors, and support during the induction year. While placing teacher education at the graduate level might make it easier to achieve improvements of this sort they can be accomplished at the undergraduate level.

--Extending the training of teachers by one or two years is costly. Hawley (1985) has estimated the increased cost to the student alone to be in excess of $20,000. Without substantial assistance programs, the added years of training would place teaching beyond the means of many Indiana students. Given the projected shortage of teachers and the lack of clear evidence of the superiority of graduate-level programs, the increased cost of training at the graduate level seems unjustified.

--At the very time when leaders in Indiana are calling for schools to prepare students who are ready to function in an information society, the impact of the proposed program shift would produce the opposite result in the elementary schools. Given the choice of undergraduate majors, it is unlikely that many prospective elementary teachers would elect majors in the sciences and mathematics, already areas of weakness for such students. Instead, elementary majors would typically choose majors from among the humanities. The general education requirements for such

majors typically demand less course work in mathematics and science than is already required for elementary majors. If COTEP institutions prepared elementary teachers at the graduate level, they would either have to accept this low level of preparation in the math/science area or require undergraduate level make-up courses in addition to the graduate professional work, which would further extend the length of their training.

--It is typical and reasonable for beginning teachers to wait until they have begun teaching to decide upon the specifics of the further training they will need. For example, a biology major assigned to teach physics, his minor, might decide to return to summer school for additional work intended to strengthen his preparation in physics. Likewise, a social studies teacher with limited course work in world history might decide to take further courses in that area once her teaching assignment called for her to teach three world history classes. In these and similar cases, students who had already invested five or six years in their initial preparation would be unlikely to voluntarily invest in still additional training regardless of how appropriate or needed it might be.

--Recruiting more minority students into teacher education is a major concern of COTEP member institutions. To add one or two years to the training (and cost) required to become a teacher, without appropriate incentives such as higher salaries or opportunities for career advancement, would reduce still further the number of minority students selecting teaching as a career.

--Because of the increased cost in both time and money, teacher education at the graduate level will reduce the number of people choosing teaching as a career. With the supply of new teachers already predicted to fall short of the demand, graduate level teacher education will make the shortage even worse. The result at the local level will be even more classes taught by persons with emergency certificates or by teachers working in areas other than those in which they are certified.

--Shifting teacher education to the graduate level would have the effect of reinstating the masters degree requirement for teachers, when only two years ago the Indiana General Assembly abolished that requirement in favor of a renewable license. The requirement that teachers periodically obtain additional training is certainly professionally defensible but with current pay and working conditions it is not economically realistic to add one or two more years of pre-service training to the preparation of entry level teachers and on top of that require even more training periodically to renew their license.

--With teacher education totally removed from the undergraduate level, arts and sciences departments would have even less reason to cooperate in developing courses designed to help prospective teachers learn what they need to know in order to teach others. The subject matter preparation of teachers would be totally driven by the needs of academic majors. Because we believe that modifications in the liberal arts portion of teacher education is

one of the keys to improving teacher education, we view this reduced need for cooperation as a serious disadvantage.

--Some of the knowledge and skills needed by the beginning teacher are not graduate level work. Shifting the training program to the graduate level would not eleminate the need for such training experiences. Instead, it would require them to be inapproprpiately classified as graduate work.

Viewed in the Indiana context the proposal to abandon undergraduate teacher education at the COTEP institutions did not seem appropriate. Such a move would have been inconsistent with the needs of Indiana's young people and with the educational demands of its public schools. More importantly, a strategy built around modifying our undergraduate programs seemed more likely to succeed.

APPENDIX II

BOARD, PANEL, WRITING TEAM AND STAFF

COTEP Policy Board

Richard Clokey
Vice President for
Academic Affairs
Indiana State University

Malcolm H. Forbes
Vice President for
Academic Affairs
University of Evansville

Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis
Vice President--Bloomington
Indiana University

J. Stephen Hazlett
Dean
School of Education
Indiana State University

James V. Koch
Provost and Vice President
for Academic Affairs
Ball State University

Robert B. Kane
Director of Teacher
Education
Purdue University

Theodore J. Kowalski
Dean
Teachers College
Ball State University

Joseph F. Lamberti
Dean
College of Education
Butler University

Howard Mehlinger
Dean
School of Education
Indiana University

Patricia Meszaros
Dean
Liberal Arts and Sciences
Butler University

Ralph D. Templeton
Acting Dean
School of Education
University of Evansville

Varro E. Tyler
Executive Vice President and
Provost
Purdue University

COTEP Advisory Panel

Russel L. Able
Indiana Secondary
School Administrators

H. Dean Evans
Indiana Department of
Education

Paul W. Farmer
Indiana Congress of
Parents and Teachers

Warren Garner
Indiana Association of
Colleges for Teacher Education

Linda Jester
Indiana Congress on Education

Richard B. Miller
Indiana Federation of Teachers

W. Jack Peterson
Indiana School Board
Association

Rodney R. Rich
Indiana Association of Public
School Superintendents

Don Small
Indiana Association of
Elementary School Principals

Barbara King
Indiana State Teachers
Association

COTEP Writing Team

James Bauman
Reading Clinic
Purdue University

Roger Boop
College of Education
Butler University

Michael Cohen
Director of Undergraduate Studies--Indianpolis
Indiana University

Claudia Crump
Department of Elementary Education
Indiana University

Joseph Lamberti
College of Education
Butler University

Ernest McDaniel
Educational Psychology & Research Methodology
Purdue University

Van Neie
Physics Education
Purdue University

Anna Ochoa
Director of Undergraduate Studies--Bloomington
Indiana University

Sharon Kingen
Higher Education & Foundations
Ball State University

Michael Rosenberg
Department of Special Education
Ball State University

Jerry Summers
Department of Secondary Education
Indiana State University

Ralph Templeton
School of Education
University of Evansville

Ann Williams
Department of Elementary Education
Ball State University

Robert Williams
Department of Secondary Education
Indiana State University

COTEP STAFF

Aloma Billings Secretary	Gerald Marker Executive Secretary	Judith Meloy Graduate Assistant

APPENDIX III

COMMISSIONED PAPERS

COTEP Commissioned Papers

Teacher Education Admission Testing: Development and Implementation
Richard Antes -- Indiana State University

Craftsmen and Scholars: The Case for Academic Majors in Teacher Education
Donald Barnes -- Ball State University

The Case for Case Studies in Teacher Education
Harry Broudy -- University of Illinois

Laboratory Methods in Teacher Training: Rationale and Use
David Gliessman -- Indiana University

Advice for the Talent Scout
J. Dudley Herron -- Purdue University

Successful Teacher Education Programs Depend Upon Cooperative Relationships Between Public/Private Schools and Colleges and Universities
Donald Jones -- Ball State University

Liberal Studies in Teacher Education
David Memory -- Indiana State University

Reform in Teacher Education: A Sociological View
Phillip Schlechty -- University of Louisville

The Case for Maintaining Teacher Education at the Undergraduate Level
Alan Tom -- Washington University, St. Louis

Minorities in Teacher Education
Stanley Warren -- DePauw University

APPENDIX IV

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

(The following recommendations are listed in the order in which they appear in the text. The numbers shown at the end of each recommendation indicate on which page of the report the full recommendation/rationale/implementation statement may be found.)

--The State of Indiana should establish a forgivable loan program for students preparing to be teachers. (p. 13)

--COTEP member institutions should mount a cooperative recruitment effort to attract minority students to the teaching profession. (p. 14)

--COTEP institutions will communicate to state and national constituencies the quality and effectiveness of their teacher training programs. (p. 15)

--COTEP institutions should move to bring their standards for admission to their teacher education programs into line with those recently adopted by NCATE. (p. 18)

--COTEP schools should adopt a common test of basic skills. (p. 19)

--COTEP institutions should admit students in identifiable groups (classes) and keep these groups together as they progress through the teacher education program. (p. 21)

--COTEP institutions should provide established, known, checkpoints at specified intervals in the teacher education program. (p. 22)

--Each COTEP institution should establish local committees which will reexamine the academic major and minor requirements for secondary and junior high/middle school teachers and recommend changes which will bring those requirements into line with the knowledge needed by students preparing to teach those subjects in the public schools. (p. 28)

--Every elementary major should have experienced at least one discipline, preferably at the level equivalent to a minor. The academic work used to meet this requirement should include specially designed courses as well as courses from the regular

Arts & Sciences (A&S) curriculum which have been specifically designated as appropriate. (p. 30)

--A major goal of the teacher education programs at COTEP institutions should be to develop teachers who are thoughtful about their teaching and who make decisions on that basis. (p. 33)

--Professional courses in the teacher education program should provide students with information about research on effective teaching (both its value and its limitations), as well as opportunities to observe, practice, and evaluate these behaviors. (p. 35)

--Every teacher education program should include experiences related to how students learn. (p. 37)

--Over the duration of the teacher education program the complexity of instructional environments should increase and students should assume increasing amounts of responsibility for performing in instructional settings. (p. 38)

--Member institutions should jointly develop simulated experiences which are designed to supplement instruction and serve to facilitate the transition from the college classroom to the school setting. (p. 40)

--COTEP institutions should cooperatively design and develop a series of case studies around generic problems/situations which confront all students in teacher education. These cases should receive repeated attention throughout the training programs at all six institutions. (p. 42)

--Students preparing to be teachers should have a working knowledge of issues related to cultural and gender differences as they pertain to how students learn. (p. 43)

--Teacher education courses at COTEP member institutions should include opportunities for students to gain an international perspective. (p. 44)

--The professional portion of teacher education should be organized in such a way as to give it an even greater integration which causes it to become the focus of students during a part of their college experience. (p. 47)

--COTEP institutions are encouraged to experiment with programs designed to respond to the unusual needs and circumstances of non-traditional students, e.g., persons wishing mid-life career changes. (p. 48)

--Where student numbers permit, a variety of alternative program themes should be developed within the structure of the teacher education program. (p. 50)

--COTEP universities should engage in a cooperative analysis of the results of the National Teacher Examination. This analysis of actual student performance on the test should be used as one basis for modifying training programs at the six institutions as well as being used to suggest revisions of the examination to the State Department of Education. (p. 51)

--COTEP institutions should take leadership roles in initiating collaborative experiences involving schools of education and cooperating school systems. (p. 53)

--COTEP institutions should initiate a plan to systematically screen, select, evaluate, and up-date all individuals (university supervisor, classroom supervisor, etc.) involved in the different levels of field-based laboratory experiences, including student teaching. (p. 54)

--COTEP institutions should lead an effort to secure additional funding in order to compensate adequately in-service teachers who volunteer to supervise all levels of practica. (p. 55)

--Member institutions should enter into deliberations with cooperating schools for the purpose of setting criteria for the selection and evaluation of field-based supervisors. (p. 56)

--Member institutions should recommend to the State Department of Education that they jointly move forward in their efforts to secure licensing for in-school student teaching supervisors and that, as soon as possible, only those who have been properly certified be permitted to supervise student teachers. Qualifying for such licensing should include the completion of both instruction and internship experiences related to the supervision process. (p. 59)

--Member institutions should work toward improved university supervision of the student teaching experience. They should provide training which would enable the university supervisor to fulfill his/her responsibilities based upon knowledge of the

campus programs, courses and learning experiences, as well as the school program, its philosophy and practices. (p. 60)

--To bring more prestige and expertise to the role of the university supervisor in all clinical experiences, COTEP universities should develop a program for continual supervisory skill development and an equitable formula for assigning supervisory loads based upon a set number of student teachers per university work load credit, mileage to the field sites from the campus and number of students clustered per school. This formula should be recognized by other divisions of the university and be reflected in the promotion and tenure process. (p. 61)

--Member institutions should form coalitions with local school districts for the purpose of planning induction year experiences which support and further the education of beginning teachers. (p. 64)

--COTEP universities should take the lead in calling for the formation of a committee which will analyze the current version of the National Teacher Examination and recommend periodic revisions. (p. 66)

--COTEP institutions should work with the State Department of Education to develop a new licensing pattern which incorporates a one year probationary license for first year teachers. (p. 67)

--COTEP universities should implement a program in which all persons involved in the teacher education process are given the opportunity to participate in some form of direct service to children. Assignment to educational facilities should occur every several years to insure that instruction and practicum supervision remain relevant. (p. 70)